arXiv:1511.05600v3 [stat.AP] 25 Jun 2016

# Semiparametric Estimation of CES Demand System with Observed and Unobserved Product Characteristics*

Ali Hortaçsu† Joonhwi Joo‡

First Version: June 14, 2015
Current Version: June 25, 2016

**Abstract**

We develop a demand estimation framework with observed and unobserved product characteristics based on the Marshallian demand system derived from the budget constrained CES utility maximization problem. The demand system we develop can nest the logit demand system with observed and unobserved product characteristics, which has been widely used since Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995). Furthermore, our CES demand estimation framework can accommodate zero predicted and observed market shares by separating the extensive and the intensive margins. We apply our framework to the scanner data of cola sales, which shows that the estimated demand curves can even be upward sloping if zero market shares are not properly accommodated.

JEL classification: C51, D11, D12

*We wish to thank Jean-Pierre Dubé, Steven T. Berry, Chad Syverson, Frank Wolak, Peter Newberry, Gaurab Aryal, Robert J. LaLonde, Devesh Raval, Alexander MacKay, seminar participants at the University of Chicago, IIOC 2016, Econometric Society NASM 2016, and SED 2016 for their valuable comments and suggestions. Kyeongbae Kim provided an excellent research assistance. All remaining errors are ours.

†Department of Economics, University of Chicago, and NBER. hortacsu@uchicago.edu

‡Department of Economics, University of Chicago. joonhwi@uchicago.edu

# 1 Introduction

The Constant Elasticity of Substitution (henceforth CES) preferences, often referred to as the Dixit-Stiglitz-Spence preferences, has long been used to analyze the markets with product differentiation in the macroeconomics and international trade literature since Spence (1976); Dixit and Stiglitz (1977); Krugman (1980). However, recent analyses on the demand of differentiated products in the empirical industrial organization literature since the seminal works by Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995) have been based on a completely different microfoundation: the discrete choice random utility model in the product characteristics space. In this paper, we reconcile these two different approaches of the differentiated products demand estimation by adding the "quality kernel" to the CES preferences. The quality kernel is a nonnegative function which maps the observed and unobserved product characteristics to the marginal utility multiplier of consuming one unit of a specific product. It allows us (i) to incorporate the observed and unobserved product characteristics in the CES preferences, (ii) to derive the same predicted market share equation with that of Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995), and (iii) to accommodate the zero predicted and observed market shares directly. We further demonstrate how one can semiparametrically estimate the product differentiated demand model with the data which has a multitude of zero observed market shares.

Demand estimation has been considered to be a central problem in the industrial organization. The recent empirical industrial organization literature has taken the characteristics space approach in demand estimation, which was pioneered by Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995). In the characteristics space approach, a product is defined as a bundle of observed and unobserved product characteristics. In the baseline model of Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995), a consumer can choose up to one product which yields the highest utility among her finite choice set, or can decide not to buy anything. A consumer's (dis)utility of consuming a product is comprised of the utility from price, observed product characteristics, unobserved product characteristics, and the idiosyncratic utility shock. The individual choice probability equation is derived from the distributional properties of the idiosyncratic utility shock, which is assumed to follow the Type-I extreme value distribution. Then the individual choice probabilities are taken as the predicted quantity shares of the individual demand. We refer to the demand models based on these microfoundations as the logit demand models henceforth. The logit demand models provided a tractable way to estimate differentiated products demands systems by reducing the dimension of parameters to be estimated. Furthermore, as analyzed by Nevo (2001); Petrin (2002) and many others, characteristics space approach allows for the counterfactuals such as the welfare effects of introducing new goods in a market.

As a drawback of such a tractability, logit demand models have imposed some strong assumptions that are often unrealistic. To be specific, the following features of the logit demand models have been often criticized: single choice assumption, lack of income effects in the derived demand system, impossibility of accommodating zero shares, and ignoring dynamics (See, e.g., Ackerberg et al. (2007); Nevo (2000); Reiss and Wolak (2007) among others). We resolve the first three prob-

lems by developing a new microfoundation for the logit demand estimation frameworks, based on the Marshallian demand system generated from solving the budget constrained CES utility maximization problem.

Our first contribution to the literature is that we develop a novel, tractable, and flexible method to incorporate the observed and unobserved product characteristics in the CES demand system. Starting from Feenstra (1994), CES preferences and its variants have been widely used in the macroeconomics and international trade literature to estimate the welfare effects from product varieties, allowing free trade, and so on. Among recent papers, Broda and Weinstein (2006) estimate the elasticities of substitution for a vast number of goods, and Bronnenberg (2015); Li (2013) estimate the utility from product varieties. Handbury (2013); Handbury and Weinstein (2014) calculate the city-specific price indices based on the preference parameters estimates of a multi-stage CES utility function. Although many works are closely related to, and have a room to incorporate the product characteristics, none of them directly modeled the utility from the product characteristics to the extent of our knowledge. Indeed, the widespread perception seems to be that the CES preferences are not flexible enough to incorporate the observed and unobserved product characteristics, and therefore it is not appropriate for analyzing the microdata (See, e.g. Aguirregabiria and Nevo (2013); Nevo (2011)). The only possible exception we acknowledge is the paper by Einav et al. (2014), which analyzed the effect of sales tax in eBay. The authors put the sales tax indicator and the distance from the seller in the taste parameter of the CES demand system. However, in a strict sense they are not the product characteristics in the context of consumer demand estimation.

Our second contribution is that we provide a concrete linkage between the CES demand system and the logit demand system, which have been considered to be fundamentally different. We do so by deriving the same predicted quantity market share equation of the logit demand system from the Marshallian demand system derived from solving the budget constrained CES utility maximization problem.

The CES demand system and the logit demand system are considered to be different for the following two major reasons. Firstly, they are based on starkly different microfoundations. CES demand system is based on the CES preferences with infinitely divisible products. By solving the budget constrained utility maximization problem, the consumer's Marshallian demand function is derived. In the logit demand system, a consumer can choose up to one product among her choice set, which yields the maximal (indirect) utility without being budget constrained. Then, by assuming the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d. henceforth) Type-I extreme value distributed additive idiosyncratic shocks on the utility, the corresponding individual choice probability expressions are derived from the statistical property of the Type-I extreme value distribution. The individual choice probability expressions are taken as the individual quantity shares, and then aggregated across homogenous or heterogenous individuals. The result of the aggregation is taken as the predicted market shares, which are equated with the observed market shares for identification and estimation of the model parameters. Another major difference lies in the product characteristics,

which is the key element comprising the logit demand models developed by Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995). Although an early paper by Anderson et al. (1987) points out the similarities of the CES demand system and the logit demand system, none of the existing works considered the observed and unobserved product characteristics as a direct argument of the CES utility function.

We derive the predicted quantity market share expressions of the homogenous and random coefficient logit demand systems as a solution of the budget constrained CES utility maximization problem using what we denote as the quality kernel. This equivalence result of the CES demand system and the homogenous/random coefficient logit demand system is remarkable for both empirical industrial organization literature and macroeconomics/international trade literature. For the empirical industrial organization literature, it provides an additional appealing microfoundation for the existing logit demand estimation frameworks. For macroeconomics/international trade literature, it provides a strong justification that allows for the demand system based on the CES preferences to use the identification results and estimation methods developed for the logit demand models.

Our third main contribution is that we provide a direct method to accommodate the zero predicted and observed market shares using the quality kernel. We embed both the extensive and the intensive margins on the quality kernel. It allows us to model the consumer's choice as a two-stage decision process. In the first stage, the consumer chooses the choice set. In the second stage, for each product in the choice set, the consumer chooses how much to buy. The idea to model both the extensive and the intensive margins in a single utility maximization problem was first pioneered by Hanemann (1984), and followed by Chiang (1991); Chintagunta (1993); Nair et al. (2005). However, all these previous works rely on the single-choice assumption, in that the consumer chooses up to one brand/product. Our framework overcomes the single-choice assumption, allowing the consumer to purchase multiple brands/products.

As a result of separately modeling the extensive margin and the intensive margin, we provide an empirically tractable estimation framework that can accommodate the zero observed quantity market shares. Accommodating the zero observed quantity market shares has been a major difficulty in the demand estimation literature for the last two decades since Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995). The discrete choice frameworks with an additive idiosyncratic error that has unrestricted support inherently rules out the zero individual choice probabilities. The individual choice probabilities are taken as the predicted individual quantity shares, aggregated over homogenous or heterogenous individuals, and then equated with the observed market shares for identification and estimation of the model parameters.

This is exactly the case with the logit demand models, of which the additive idiosyncratic shocks are distributed as an i.i.d. Type-I extreme value. In such a case, the exponential functions in the numerator of the predicted market shares expressions are inevitable. This implies that provided a product yields any utility higher than negative infinity, the product must have a strictly positive predicted market shares. But, the zero observed market shares, which is equated with the predicted

market shares for identification and estimation of model parameters, are very often observed in the data. Hence, in practice, researchers just dropped the samples with zero observed market shares or added a small arbitrary number on the zero observed market shares. Both measures suffer from causing the bias in the estimates. By modeling the extensive and intensive margins separately, we argue that the selection process on the consumer's choice set must be considered for identification and estimation of model parameters. This choice set selection drives the conditional expectation of the unobserved product characteristics conditioned on the instruments to be nonzero, and it is highly likely to be positive. The usual GMM estimation will yield estimates that are biased upward when this choice set selection process is ignored.

There is one remarkable recent paper by Gandhi et al. (2013), which can rationalize the zero observed market shares in a different way than ours. They take the zero observed market shares as measurement errors of strictly positive predicted market shares, and provide a partial identification result of the model parameters. The critical difference between their work and ours is that ours rationalize the zero predicted market shares as well as the zero observed market shares, while they allow only the observed market shares to be zero. Nonetheless, their Monte-Carlo simulations and empirical applications show the result that has a very similar implication to ours: when the data with the zero market shares are dropped, the price coefficient estimates will be biased upward. In the international trade literature, another closely related to our method was developed by Helpman et al. (2008) in the context of the gravity models. They use a gravity model with endogenous censoring in the trade volumes. Their structural approach to handle the zero trade flows is similar to ours. Yet, they assumed the Gaussian error term while we do not specify the distribution of unobservables in our preferred specification. In our empirical example, we also provide an evidence that the distribution of the unobservable product characteristics is far from Gaussian.

Our work can be viewed as a "hedonic model" or "pure characteristics model" of demand, in that we do not require an i.i.d. random utility shocks on the utility specification. Recent developments on the hedonic demand estimation frameworks were made by Bajari and Benkard (2005); Berry and Pakes (2007), of which the former is more closely related to our work. Bajari and Benkard study the general hedonic model of demand with product characteristics, and they mainly focus on the local identification and estimation of the model parameters. For the global identification when the product space is continuous, they specify the Cobb-Douglas preferences. Our work can be viewed as an extension to the CES preferences with product characteristics, which can also accommodate the zero predicted and observed market shares.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the general microfoundation of the CES demand system with product characteristics. Section 3 provides the linkage between CES demand system and logit demand system. Section 4 presents the semiparametric estimation method when the data contains a multitude of zero shares. Section 5 presents simulation evidences. In Section 6, we implement our estimation method to a scanner data of cola sales. Section 7 concludes. In Appendix A, the derivation of the logit demand system developed by Berry (1994);

Berry et al. (1995) is illustrated for completeness.

# 2 CES Demand System with Observed and Unobserved Product Characteristics

## 2.1 Specification of the CES Demand System

We consider a differentiated product market denoted by subscript $t$ composed of homogenous consumers with a CES preference. For now we focus on the homogenous consumers, and the extension to the product markets composed of the heterogenous consumers in which each consumer may have different utility parameters will be considered in Section 3.1.

The utility from a product category is given by:

$$u\left(\left\{q_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_t}\right) := \left(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_t} \left\{\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right)\right\}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} q_{j,t}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}}. \tag{2.1}$$

The set $\mathcal{J}_t$ is a set of the alternatives in the category, which may or may not include the numeraire that represents the outside option. $q_{j,t}$ is the quantity of product $j$ consumed in market $t$. $\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right)$, what we define by the "quality kernel," is a nonnegative function of observed and unobserved product characteristics. $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$ and $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ are vectors of product $j$'s characteristics in market $t$, which are observable to the econometrician. $\xi_{j,t}$ and $\eta_{j,t}$ are scalars representing the utility from product $j$'s characteristics that are not observable to the econometrician. $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ and $\eta_{j,t}$ are the extensive margin shifters that a consumer considers whether to buy the product or not. $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$ and $\xi_{j,t}$ are the intensive margin shifters that determine the level of utility when a consumer buys the product. $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$ may have common components, but we may require the exclusion restriction on $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ for a semiparametric identification when the extensive margin actually matters; in such a case $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ has to contain at least one component that is not in $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$. We will explain further about the identification conditions later in Section 4. As an important remark, we note that the observed extensive margin shifters $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ may contain the prices $p_{j,t}$ or a nonlinear function of $p_{j,t}$.

The quality kernel $\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right)$ in (2.1) plays the key role in our analysis. Conventionally, researchers have put some taste parameters or utility weights in the place where we put the quality kernel. They commonly have the interpretation of a multiplier to the (marginal) utility of consuming a specific product. The quality kernel is a straightforward extension of such conventions, which allows to directly incorporate the observed and unobserved product characteristics in consumer's utility. Furthermore, it allows the possibility of explicitly separating the extensive margin and the intensive margin. This feature will play a key role in accommodating the zero predicted and observed market shares in the model parameters estimation.

The representative consumer's budget constrained utility maximization problem, the solution of

which is the Marshallian demand system, is as follows:

$$\max_{\{q_{j,t}\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_t}} \left( \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_t} \left\{ \chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right) \right\}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} q_{j,t}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}} \qquad s.t. \qquad \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_t} p_{j,t} q_{j,t} = y_t. \tag{2.2}$$

The Marshallian demand system is given by, for each $j \in \mathcal{J}_t$,

$$q_{j,t} = y_t \left\{ \frac{\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right) p_{j,t}^{-\sigma}}{\sum_{k\in\mathcal{J}_t} \chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{k,t}, \xi_{k,t}, \mathbf{w}_{k,t}, \eta_{k,t}\right) p_{k,t}^{1-\sigma}} \right\}, \tag{2.3}$$

which leads to the following predicted quantity market shares expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{j,t} &\equiv \frac{q_{j,t}}{\sum_{k\in\mathcal{J}_t} q_{k,t}} \\ &= \frac{\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right) p_{j,t}^{-\sigma}}{\sum_{k\in\mathcal{J}_t} \chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{k,t}, \xi_{k,t}, \mathbf{w}_{k,t}, \eta_{k,t}\right) p_{k,t}^{-\sigma}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

(2.4) is what we refer to the CES demand system with observed and unobserved product characteristics. The demand system (2.4), which is in the form of the predicted quantity market shares, is our main interest because it turns out that the same predicted quantity market share expression of Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995) can be derived by imposing a further structure on the quality kernel $\chi(\cdot)$. Note that (2.4), a system of predicted quantity market shares, imposes only $\#(\mathcal{J}_t) - 1$ linear constraints on the Marshallian demand system $\mathbf{q}_t$ in (2.3). Only when combined with the budget constraints the Marshallian demand quantities $\mathbf{q}_t$ can be uniquely pinned down for a given price vector $(\mathbf{p}_t, y_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{\#(\mathcal{J}_t)+1}$.[1]

For the invertibility of the demand system (2.4), we shall consider the subset $\mathcal{J}_t^+ (\subseteq \mathcal{J}_t)$ such that $\pi_{j,t} > 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{J}_t^+$. The demand system specified by $\{\pi_{j,t}\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_t^+}$ satisfies the "connected substitutes" conditions by Berry et al. (2013), and thus invertible. It implies $\sigma$, the elasticity of substitution, is identified. Furthermore, if we impose suitable structures on $\chi(\cdot)$ such as monotonicity with index restriction, the structural parameters of $\chi(\cdot)$ are also identified. We shall investigate further on the specific functional forms of $\chi(\cdot)$ in Section 3.

In Appendix A, we illustrate the derivation of the logit demand system, which is the counterpart of our CES demand system in the following sections.

## 2.2 Properties of the CES demand system and Comparison to the Logit demand System

In this subsection, we explain the properties of the CES demand system (2.4). The demand system that we propose, which is derived from the budget constrained CES utility maximization problem,

[1] See Joo and Kim (2016) for a proof and a further discussion on this point.

has a few more desirable properties over the logit demand system.

We begin with the Marshallian and the Hicksian own and cross price elasticities of the demand system. Let $b_{j,t}$ be the budget share of product $j$ in market $t$. Denote $\varepsilon^M_{jc,t}$ and $\varepsilon^H_{jc,t}$ by the Marshallian and the Hicksian cross price elasticities between alternatives $j$ and $c$ respectively. If $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ does not include the prices or function of the prices as its component, we have the following simple closed-form formula for the Marshallian and the Hicksian own and cross price elasticities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^M_{jj,t} &= -\sigma + (\sigma - 1)\, b_{j,t} \\
\varepsilon^M_{jc,t} &= (\sigma - 1)\, b_{c,t} \\
\varepsilon^H_{jj,t} &= -\sigma\,(1 - b_{j,t}) \\
\varepsilon^H_{jc,t} &= \sigma b_{c,t}, \qquad (2.5)
\end{aligned}$$

and the income elasticity is 1. Because the budget shares are observed in data, these elasticities can be calculated given that $\sigma$ is identified. From these elasticity expressions it is immediate that a version of independence of irrelevant alternatives property holds. That is, the substitution pattern depends solely on the budget shares of the corresponding products. It is also noteworthy that the price elasticities of the CES demand system should not be derived based on the quantity market shares as in the logit demand models.[2]

In contrast, there is no distinction between the Marshallian and the Hicksian own and cross price elasticities in the logit demand models, because the budget constraint does not bind. All the price elasticities of the logit demand models denoted by $\varepsilon^L_{jc,t}$ are in a sense compensated, which are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^L_{jj,t} &= -\alpha\,(1 - \pi_{j,t}) \\
\varepsilon^L_{jc,t} &= \alpha \pi_{c,t}.
\end{aligned}$$

[3] Notice that the only difference to the Hicksian price elasticities (2.5) derived from CES demand

[2]

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \ln \pi_{j,t}}{\partial \ln p_{j,t}} &= \frac{\partial \left(\ln q_{j,t} - \ln\left(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{J}_t} q_{k,t}\right)\right)}{\partial \ln p_{j,t}} \\
&= \frac{\partial \ln q_{j,t}}{\partial \ln p_{j,t}} - \frac{\partial \ln\left(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{J}_t} q_{k,t}\right)}{\partial \ln p_{j,t}} \\
&= \varepsilon^M_{jj,t} - \frac{\partial \ln\left(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{J}_t} q_{k,t}\right)}{\partial \ln p_{j,t}} \\
&\neq \frac{\partial \ln q_{j,t}}{\partial \ln p_{j,t}}
\end{aligned}$$

The term $\frac{\partial \ln \pi_{j,t}}{\partial \ln p_{j,t}}$ is the Marshallian price elasticity only when $\sum_{k\in\mathcal{J}_t} q_{k,t}$ is constant, which is the case for the logit demand models. See Appendix A for the details.

[3] We consider the price elasticities of the logit demand model when the mean utility is log-linear in prices. See

system is that the multiplied terms to the log-price coefficient $\alpha$ are composed of the quantity market shares, not the budget shares.

If $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ includes the prices or a function of the prices so that the extensive margin is affected by the price changes, simple closed-form expressions for the own and cross elasticities cannot be derived. In practice, the corresponding price elasticities can be calculated using simulation.

As we have derived the demand system from the budget constrained CES utility maximization problem, the duality between the Marshallian demand function and the Hicksian demand function holds. The Slutsky equation follows. Hence, we can decompose the substitution effect and the income effect in a more natural way. The Slutsky equation in the elasticity form is given by:

$$\varepsilon^M_{jc,t} = \varepsilon^H_{jc,t} - \varepsilon^I_{j,t} b_{c,t}.$$

Because $\varepsilon^I_{j,t} = 1$ in the CES demand system, the income effect depends solely on the budget shares, which is a considerable limitation. However, there are at least two advantages over the discrete choice counterpart. First, the income effect depends on the budget shares, not on the quantity shares. In the logit demand models, the income effect of a product with a tiny budget share and a large quantity share will be large, which is even more unrealistic. Next, although the numeraire can be included in the consumer's choice set $\mathcal{J}_t$, it is not necessary in our CES demand system. In contrast, the inclusion of the numeraire in the choice set is necessary in the logit demand system in which the budget constraint never binds. If the numeraire is not included in the choice set, a price increase of an alternative will only lead the consumers to switch to other alternatives in the choice set, which implies that there is no income effect at all. In a sense the magnitude of the income effect is a priori determined by the researcher in the logit demand models, because the income effect solely depends on the quantity market shares of the numeraire. The size of them is very often arbitrarily assumed or imposed by the researcher in practice.

# 3 The Exponential Quality Kernel

We let $\chi(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t})$ flexible thus far. In principle, $\chi(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t})$ can be any nonnegative function. Under this weak restriction, the demand system specified by the predicted market shares (2.4) may be locally identified, as studied in Bajari and Benkard (2005). However, nonparametric estimation of the locally identified demand system places a considerable burden on the data and on the computational power, which is often impractical. Furthermore, the locally identified parameter values are often uninformative for the counterfactual analyses. Alternatively, we can impose further structures on the consumer utility from the product characteristics.

We focus on the exponential quality kernel with an index restriction. This specific functional form is remarkable for two prominent reasons. First, by using this functional form, we can derive the

Section 3.1 for a further discussion.

same individual choice probability equation of the homogenous and random coefficients logit models of demand from the CES demand system developed in the previous section. Second, it simplifies the estimation problem substantially, because the demand system reduces to the log-linear form. We use the exponential quality kernel to suggest a tractable semiparametric estimation method which can also accommodate the zero predicted and observed market shares.

### 3.1 Nesting the Homogenous and Random Coefficients Logit Models of Demand

In this subsection, we show that the predicted quantity market shares expressions of the homogenous and random coefficients logit models of demand can be derived from (2.4) by choosing a specific functional form of the quality kernel $\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right)$.

Suppose $\mathbf{x}_{j,t} = \mathbf{w}_{j,t}$, $\xi_{j,t} = \eta_{j,t}$, $\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}\right) > 0$, $\pi_{j,t} > 0$ and let $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$ be exogenous for all $j, t$. We do not require an exclusion restriction in this setup because the predicted quantity shares are positive for every alternative. Let $\mathcal{J}_t$ contain the numeraire denoted by product 0, and normalize $p_{0,t} = 1$.[4] Taking ratios of product $j$ and product 0, and then taking logarithm on (2.4) yields:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\pi_{j,t}}{\pi_{0,t}}\right) = -\sigma \ln\left(p_{j,t}\right) + \ln \chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}\right) - \ln \chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{0,t}, \xi_{0,t}\right). \tag{3.1}$$

It is straightforward that if we normalize $\mathbf{x}_{0,t} = \mathbf{0}$, $\xi_{0,t} = 0$ and let $\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}\right) = \exp\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \xi_{j,t}\right)$, (3.1) becomes:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\pi_{j,t}}{\pi_{0,t}}\right) = -\sigma \ln\left(p_{j,t}\right) + \mathbf{x}_{j,t}'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \xi_{j,t}. \tag{3.2}$$

(3.2) is the estimation equation of the homogenous logit model of demand, except that in (3.2) the $\ln\left(p_{j,t}\right)$ enters in place of $p_{j,t}$, which has been a convention in the literature. The logarithm of price should be used in (3.2) because it is inherited from the consumer's budget constraint. On the other hand, we observe that $\ln\left(p_{j,t}\right)$ can also enter in place of $p_{j,t}$ in the utility specification of the logit demand system. That is, by substituting $\ln\left(p_{j,t}\right)$ with $p_{j,t}$ in the linear utility specification in the logit demand model, the CES demand system we propose exactly lines up with the homogenous logit demand system. We take this substitution with the logarithm of prices as a simple scale adjustment in the linear utility specification of the logit demand model.

The random coefficients logit model of demand by Berry et al. (1995) can be nested in the same way. Let $i$ denote an individual, and let us suppress the market subscript $t$ for a while. For the sake of notational simplicity, let $\phi_j := \ln p_j$. Suppose we specify the quasi-linear utility of the random coefficients logit model of demand as

$$u_{i,j} = \alpha_i\left(\ln y_i - \phi_j\right) + \mathbf{x}_j'\boldsymbol{\beta}_i + \xi_j + \epsilon_{i,j}.$$

[4] We emphasize again that $\mathcal{J}_t$ may not contain a numeraire for our CES demand system. In such a case, product 0 can be taken as any alternative in $\mathcal{J}_t$, and all the following estimation equations should be adjusted in terms of the differences between $j$ and 0.

On the other hand, the individual quantity shares expressions of the CES demand system (2.4) becomes:

$$\pi_{i,j} = \frac{\chi_i(\mathbf{x}_j, \xi_j)\exp(-\sigma_i\phi_j)}{\sum_{k=0}^{J}\chi_i(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_k)\exp(-\sigma_i\phi_k)} \tag{3.3}$$

$$= \frac{\exp\left(-\sigma_i\phi_j + \mathbf{x}_j'\boldsymbol{\beta}_i + \xi_j\right)}{\sum_{k=0}^{J}\exp\left(-\sigma_i\phi_k + \mathbf{x}_k'\boldsymbol{\beta}_i + \xi_k\right)}, \tag{3.4}$$

where the second equality follows by specifying $\chi_i(\mathbf{x}_j, \xi_j) = \exp\left(\mathbf{x}_j'\boldsymbol{\beta}_i + \xi_j\right)$. Notice that (3.4) is almost exactly the same as the individual choice probability equation obtained in Berry et al. (1995).[5] The predicted market shares equation is obtained by aggregating these individual quantity shares over $i$.

Discussions in the current subsection provides the microfoundation and justification for international trade and macroeconomics literature based on the CES demand system to use the differentiated products demand estimation methods developed in empirical industrial organization literature since Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995); Nevo (2001). After the model parameters are estimated, the price and income elasticities can be calculated according to the expressions given in (2.5), and the welfare analyses can be conducted correspondingly.

However, the discrete choice differentiated products demand estimation literature has imposed one critical restriction which has been regarded as necessary in inverting the individual choice probabilities: $\pi_{j,t} > 0$ for all $j, t$.[6] The restriction is inevitable in the logit demand models which assume the additive idiosyncratic shocks on the preferences distributed with the unrestricted support. The most important example in the literature has been the additive i.i.d. Type-I extreme value distributed shocks. The individual choice probabilities derived from the assumption must have exponential functions in the numerators of choice probabilities.

Zero quantity market shares are very often observed in data, which are equated with the predicted market shares for identification and estimation of the model parameters. Within the logit demand frameworks, it has often been regarded impossible to rationalize the zero predicted market shares. In contrast, flexibility of the quality kernel $\chi(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t})$ in our model allows us to accommodate the zero predicted market shares by embedding the buy-or-not decision of the consumer, which determines the extensive margins. In the following subsection, we illustrate how we can directly accommodate the zero predicted and observed market shares.

[5]The only structural difference is the correlation structure of the individual heterogeneity. That is, we have to assume $Cov(\sigma_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) = \mathbf{0}$. Because those cross-correlations are often assumed to be zero in practice when estimating the random coefficients logit model of demand (See, e.g. Dube et al. (2012)), we do not take the restriction as a serious limitation.

[6]For a detailed discussion on share inversion, see Berry et al. (2013).

### 3.2 Accommodating Zero Predicted and Observed Market Shares: Separating the Extensive and Intensive Margins

From here we restrict our attention to the homogenous consumers again, and let $\mathbf{x}_{j,t} \neq \mathbf{w}_{j,t}$, $\eta_{j,t} \neq \xi_{j,t}$. Let $\mathcal{J}_t$ contain the numeraire for convenience of the illustration, and normalize $p_{0,t} = 1$. Recall the predicted market shares equation of the CES demand system:

$$\pi_{j,t} = \frac{\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right) \exp\left(-\sigma\phi_{j,t}\right)}{\sum_{k\in\mathcal{J}_t} \chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right) \exp\left(-\sigma\phi_{k,t}\right)}. \tag{3.5}$$

The expression (3.5) allows the zero predicted market shares of product $j$, by letting $\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right) = 0$ for some subset of the product characteristic space where $(\mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t})$ lives on. By taking the ratio $\pi_{j,t}/\pi_{0,t}$, we obtain a reduced form of the demand system (3.5) given by:

$$\frac{\pi_{j,t}}{\pi_{0,t}} = p_{j,t}^{-\sigma} \frac{\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right)}{\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{0,t}, \xi_{0,t}, \mathbf{w}_{0,t}, \eta_{0,t}\right)}. \tag{3.6}$$

If $\mathcal{J}_t$ does not include the numeraire, any product with a strictly positive market share can be taken as a reference product denoted by product 0. All the arguments of the current and the following section remain valid provided that the statistical independence of the observable and unobservable product characteristics across products are assumed. This assumption effectively implies that product characteristics are not correlated across products, which is in line with many existing demand estimation frameworks including Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995).

For tractability in identification and estimation, we consider the following functional form with an index restriction:

$$\chi\left(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t}\right) = \mathbf{1}\left(\left\{\gamma + \mathbf{w}_{j,t}'\boldsymbol{\delta} + \eta_{j,t} > 0\right\}\right) \exp\left(\alpha + \mathbf{x}_{j,t}'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \xi_{j,t}\right), \tag{3.7}$$

where $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ is an indicator function. Employing this quality kernel is equivalent to assuming a certain structure on the consumer's choice. The consumer first considers the utility from product characteristics represented by $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}'\boldsymbol{\delta} + \eta_{j,t}$. If it exceeds the threshold $-\gamma$, the consumer decides to buy it. Then $(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t})$ is taken into consideration, which affects the amount of consumption $q_{j,t}$. On the other hand, if the utility does not exceed the threshold $-\gamma$, the consumer decides not to buy, thus $q_{j,t} = \pi_{j,t} = 0$. We emphasize again that $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ can contain the raw prices $p_{j,t}$ or other endogenous variables provided that the corresponding instruments are available to the researcher.

In Appendix B, we provide a two-stage modeling of the consumer behavior within the logit demand frameworks when the zero market shares are present. It is shown that the two-stage modeling can also lead to the same estimation equation derived from our CES demand system, which is presented in the following section. Although we find that sticking to the logit demand frameworks is less appealing because the extensive margins and the intensive margins cannot be conceptually distinguished, there might be instances in which the single choice assumption is more

adequate. The result presented in Appendix B can be useful under such circumstances.

# 4 Semiparametric Estimation Framework with Exponential Quality Kernel and Zero Market Shares

In this section, we provide a semiparametric estimation framework for the CES demand system with exponential quality kernel, which also accommodates the zero predicted and observed market shares. The estimation method we provide is in two stages. In the first stage, the parameters that determine the extensive margins are estimated, using the efficient semiparametric estimator developed by Klein and Spady (1993). In the second stage, the parameters that determine the intensive margins are estimated, correcting for both the endogeneity in prices and the selectivity bias caused from the consumers' choice set selection. The second-stage estimator we use is developed by Ahn and Powell (1993); Powell (2001). Note that when there is no observed zero market shares, one can proceed with the existing demand estimation frameworks developed by Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995) to estimate the model parameters.

The first-stage estimation framework illustrated in this section allows only the exogenous covariates for the observed extensive margin shifters $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$. We choose this partly due to the availability of our data, and partly due to the efficiency concern.[7] If the researcher wants to include the endogenous variables such as prices in the extensive margin shifters $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$, one can proceed with the method developed by Blundell and Powell (2003, 2004) or Rothe (2009) in the first-stage. They provide the semiparametric estimation frameworks for the binary choice models with endogenous covariates.

We assume the existence of instruments for prices such that $E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}\right] = 0$, where $\mathbf{z}_{j,t}$ may include $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$. It is very well documented in the literature that $E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t}\right] \neq 0$, and it is highly likely to be positive. As a result, when the prices are not instrumented, very often upward sloping demand curves are estimated. The same intuition applies when the consumers' choice set selection is ignored and zero observed market shares are simply dropped during the estimation. That is, even after instrumenting for the prices, $E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}\right] = 0$ does not imply $E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}, \pi_{j,t} > 0\right]$ is zero. $E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}, \pi_{j,t} > 0\right]$ is likely to be positive, because consumers will select the products with high $\eta_{j,t}$ in the first-stage choice set decision, and $\eta_{j,t}$ is likely to be positively correlated with $\xi_{j,t}$. Thus, dropping the samples with zero observed market shares in the estimation will bias the price coefficients upward, which can even yield the positive price coefficients. Imputing the zero observed market shares with some small positive numbers during the estimation can cause an even more serious problem that the direction of the bias is unpredictable.

We normalize $\phi_{0,t} \equiv \ln p_{0,t} = 0$, $\xi_{0,t} = \eta_{0,t} = 0$, $\mathbf{w}_{0,t} = \mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{x}_{0,t} = \mathbf{0}$. Under the choice of $\chi\left(\cdot\right)$

[7] Although our data has an information about the product availability to the consumers even when the sales in the corresponding week/store pair is zero, it does not record the prices of the corresponding week/store when there is no sales. Thus, we could not contain the endogenous variable $p_{j,t}$ in $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ in the first-stage estimation. The characteristics of the data used in our empirical application will be discussed further in details in Section 6.

specified in (3.7), (3.6) simplifies to:

$$\frac{\pi_{j,t}}{\pi_{0,t}} = \mathbf{1}\left(\left\{\gamma + \mathbf{w}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\delta} + \eta_{j,t} > 0\right\}\right) \exp\left(-\sigma\phi_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \xi_{j,t}\right), \tag{4.1}$$

which is the econometric model that we are going to identify and estimate in this section. A consumer buys product $j$ if $\gamma + \mathbf{w}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\delta} + \eta_{j,t} > 0$. For the sample with $\pi_{j,t} > 0$, the demand system (4.1) further reduces to:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\pi_{j,t}}{\pi_{0,t}}\right) = -\sigma\phi_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \xi_{j,t}.$$

However, conditional expectation $E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \pi_{j,t} > 0\right]$ is not zero anymore, which leads to the sample selection problem.

Several methods to estimate the parameters of the sample selection models have been suggested in the literature under different assumptions.[8] We follow the spirit of Heckman (1979) here, which imposes the conditional mean restriction. By taking the conditional expectation, we have:

$$E\left[\ln\left(\frac{\pi_{j,t}}{\pi_{0,t}}\right)|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \pi_{j,t} > 0\right] = -\sigma\phi_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \pi_{j,t} > 0\right]. \tag{4.2}$$

Ahn and Powell (1993); Powell (2001); Newey (2009) proposed two-stage $\sqrt{N}$-consistent estimators for the model parameters of (4.2). In particular, we use Ahn and Powell (1993); Powell (2001)'s pairwise differenced weighted least squares estimator that can correct for the endogeneity of $\phi_{j,t}$ using instruments in the second stage.

In the first stage, $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ needs to be estimated. There are a few estimators for this semiparametric binary choice model, among which we use the method by Klein and Spady (1993) which achieves the asymptotic efficiency. In the second stage, the parameters $(\sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ from the following linear equation is estimated:

$$E\left[\ln\left(\frac{\pi_{j,t}}{\pi_{0,t}}\right)|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \pi_{j,t} > 0\right] = -\sigma\phi_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \lambda\left(1 - G_\eta\left(-\mathbf{w}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\delta}\right)\right) \tag{4.3}$$

where $\lambda(\cdot)$ is an unknown smooth function. For the semiparametric identification of $(\sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, it must be guaranteed that the term $\lambda\left(1 - G_\eta\left(-\mathbf{w}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\delta}\right)\right)$ is not a nontrivial linear combination of $(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t})$. It requires that some component of $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ must be excluded from $(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t})$.

We impose the following assumptions on the data generating process for the $\sqrt{N}$-consistency and asymptotic normality of our proposed estimator.

**Assumption 1.** *The vector of observed product characteristics $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ is exogenous.*

[8] For example, Powell (1984, 1986); Blundell and Powell (2007) suggested the least absolute deviation type estimator under the conditional quantile restriction, and Honoré et al. (1997) suggested the symmetric trimming under the symmetricity assumption of the error terms.

**Assumption 2.** *$\eta_{j,t}$ is independent of $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ with $E[\eta_{j,t}|\mathbf{w}_{j,t}] = 0$, and $\eta_{j,t}$ is i.i.d. over $j$ and over $t$.*

**Assumption 3.** *There exists a set of instrument $\mathbf{z}_{j,t}$ such that $\xi_{j,t} \perp\!\!\!\perp \phi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}$, $E[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}] = 0$, and $\dim(\mathbf{z}_{j,t}) \geq \dim(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t})$.*[9]

**Assumption 4.** *$\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ contains at least one component which is not included in $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$.*

**Assumption 5.** *The parameter vector $(\sigma, \alpha, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma, \boldsymbol{\delta})$ lies in a compact parameter space, with the true parameter value lying in the interior.*

**Assumption 6.** *Data generating process of $(\pi_{j,t}, \phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \mathbf{z}_{j,t})$ satisfies (C.6) of Klein and Spady (1993) and Assumption 5.7 of Powell (2001).*

**Assumption 7.** *The conditional distribution of $\eta_{j,t}$ given $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ satisfies (C.4a), (C.4b) and (C.9) of Klein and Spady (1993).*

In Assumptions 1 and 2, we are imposing the independence of the observed and unobserved product characteristics and homoskedasticity of unobservable product characteristics $\eta_{j,t}$ that is related to the extensive margins. However, we do not assume that the unobserved product characteristics and the prices are independent. We allow for the endogeneity in prices, which should be considered in the identification and estimation; the prices can be some function of the observed and unobserved product characteristics. Assumption 3 is the standard instrument condition to correct for the endogeneity in prices. For the discussions about suitable instruments in practice, see, e.g., Nevo (2001). Assumption 4 is the exclusion restriction, which is required for the identification in the second-stage. The remaining assumptions are the regularity conditions for the $\sqrt{N}$-consistency and asymptotic normality of our proposed estimator. Under Assumptions 1-7, conditions (C.1)-(C.9) of Klein and Spady (1993) and Assumptions 5.1-5.7 of Powell (2001) are satisfied.

We describe our first and second stage estimators. In the first stage, we estimate $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ using the efficient semiparametric estimator developed by Klein and Spady (1993). It allows us to estimate the parameters of the binary choice models without having to specify the distribution of the unobservables. The key insight is to replace the likelihood with its uniformly consistent estimates, and to run the pseudo maximum likelihood. The estimator is defined by:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} := \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \sum_{j,t} \left\{ \mathbf{1}(\pi_{j,t} > 0) \ln\left(1 - \hat{G}_\eta\left(-\mathbf{w}_{j,t}'\boldsymbol{\delta}\right)\right) + \mathbf{1}(\pi_{j,t} = 0) \ln\left(\hat{G}_\eta\left(-\mathbf{w}_{j,t}'\boldsymbol{\delta}\right)\right) \right\}, \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$\hat{G}_\eta\left(-\mathbf{w}_{j,t}'\boldsymbol{\delta}\right) = \hat{\tau}_{j,t} \frac{\sum_{k \neq j,t} \kappa\left(\frac{1}{h_n}(\mathbf{w}_k - \mathbf{w}_{j,t})'\boldsymbol{\delta} + \iota_0(\boldsymbol{\delta})\right)(1 - \mathbf{1}(\pi_{j,t} > 0))}{\sum_{k \neq j,t} \kappa\left(\frac{1}{h_n}(\mathbf{w}_k - \mathbf{w}_{j,t})'\boldsymbol{\delta} + \iota(\boldsymbol{\delta})\right)}.$$

[9] $\mathbf{z}_{j,t}$ may contain the exogenous component of $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$.

$\kappa(\cdot)$ is a local smoothing kernel, $h_n$ is the bandwidth, and $\hat{\tau}_{j,t}, \iota_0(\boldsymbol{\delta}), \iota(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ are trimming sequences for small estimated densities.[10] In the second stage, we follow Powell (2001). With an abuse of notation by suppressing the market index $t$ and letting $\mathbf{r}_j := (\phi_j, \mathbf{x}_j)'$, the estimator is defined by a weighted instrumental variables estimator:

$$\left(-\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \hat{\omega}_{i,j}\left(\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{z}_j\right)\left(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j\right)'\right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \hat{\omega}_{i,j}\left(\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{z}_j\right)\left(\ln\left(\frac{\pi_i}{\pi_0}\right) - \ln\left(\frac{\pi_j}{\pi_0}\right)\right)\right), \tag{4.5}$$

where $\hat{\omega}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{h_n}\kappa\left(\frac{1}{h_n}\left(\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{w}_j\right)'\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\right)$.[11] The intuition for the estimator is to cancel out the bias correction term $\lambda\left(1 - G_\eta\left(-\mathbf{w}_j'\boldsymbol{\delta}\right)\right)$; if $\mathbf{w}_i$ is the same as $\mathbf{w}_j$, the term $\lambda\left(1 - G_\eta\left(-\mathbf{w}_j'\boldsymbol{\delta}\right)\right)$ in (4.3) will be canceled out when the differences are taken. Thus, more weights are placed on the differenced term which are "close" to each other. The estimator is $\sqrt{N}$-consistent and asymptotically normal. For the closed form covariance matrix formula and its consistent estimator, see Powell (2001).

The following theorem summarizes the discussions made in this subsection thus far.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Under Assumptions 1-7, $\left(-\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)$ defined in (4.5) is $\sqrt{N}$-consistent and asymptotically normal.*

The semiparametric log-linear estimation illustrated in this subsection requires an exclusion restriction on $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ to identify $(-\sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta})$; $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ cannot be a linear combination of $(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t})$. This exclusion restriction can be circumvented by adding an interaction term or a nonlinear transformation of a nonbinary variable contained in $(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t})$. For instance, if one employs the method suggested by Blundell and Powell (2003, 2004) that can accommodate the endogenous variables in the first-stage estimation, including the raw prices $p_{j,t}$ in $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ can be a viable choice. But ideally, it would be the best to find additional exogenous variables which only affect the consumer's buy-or-not decision.

If one is willing to assume that $\eta_{j,t}$ is distributed as standard Gaussian, the classical Heckman correction estimator with instruments can be used, in which the inverse Mills ratio is added as an additional regressor. In such a case, identification of the model parameters can be achieved by the nonlinearity of the inverse Mills ratio, and hence, the exclusion restriction is not necessary.

# 5 Monte-Carlo Simulation

In this section, we simulate a market data and try to back out the model parameters to examine the finite-sample performance of the estimator we proposed in the previous section. We compare the estimation result using our model to the estimation result of the logit demand model which either

[10] We ignore these trimming sequences for technical and notational convenience from now on. Klein and Spady (1993) also note that the trimming does not affect the estimates in practice.

[11] When there are more instruments than the number of explanatory variables, the projection matrix can be calculated beforehand to figure out the $\mathbf{z}_j$ vector. Efficiency loss might be incurred, but the estimator will be still $\sqrt{N}$-consistent and asymptotically normal.

drops the sample with zero observed market shares or imputes the zero observed market shares with a small positive number. It turns out that the estimator we proposed in the previous section works very well when the model is correctly specified. The price coefficient estimates $\hat{\sigma}$ are also quite robust to the model misspecification.

We first describe the data generating process which satisfies the exclusion restriction. There are 2-5 products in each market $t$. The exact number of products by each market is randomly drawn. The observed product characteristics vector $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ includes three continuous components, one discrete component, and three brand dummies. One of the continuous component is excluded in $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$. The first component $w_{j,t}^{(1)} \sim \text{lognormal}\,(0,1)$, the second component $w_{j,t}^{(2)} \sim \text{uniform}\,(1,5)$, the third component $w_{j,t}^{(3)} \sim \text{Poisson}\,(3)$, the fourth component $w_{j,t}^{(4)} \sim \mathcal{N}\,(0,1)$. We let only $w_{j,t}^{(4)}$ is not included in $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$. $\eta_{j,t}|\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ follows Type-I extreme value distribution with mean zero.

There are two instruments for the prices, which are the proxies of the cost shocks. The prices $p_{j,t}$, which is an endogenous variable, is determined by $p_{j,t} = \psi\,(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t})$, where $\psi$ is some (possibly) nonlinear function which is strictly monotonic in $\xi_{j,t}$. To be specific, we specify $\psi$ as:

$$\psi\,(\mathbf{z}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}) = 2 + \frac{1}{50}\left(2z_{j,t}^{(1)} + 4z_{j,t}^{(2)} + 2x_{j,t}^{(1)} + x_{j,t}^{(1)}x_{j,t}^{(2)} - x_{j,t}^{(2)}x_{j,t}^{(3)} + 5x_{j,t}^{(4)} + 7x_{j,t}^{(5)} + 9x_{j,t}^{(6)} + 8\xi_{j,t}\right).$$

We intentionally let the influence of the cost proxies $z_{j,t}^{(1)}$ and $z_{j,t}^{(2)}$ to be fairly weak, which reflects the common circumstances in practice. We calibrate the parameters as $\sigma = 2$, $\alpha = 1$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (1, -2, 1.5, 0.3, 0.2, 0.4)'$, $\gamma = \alpha$, $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \frac{1}{4} \times (\boldsymbol{\beta}, 0.1)'$, and the market shares are determined by (3.5). In the data generating process, different functional form specifications on $\chi\,(\cdot)$ are used to examine the performances of the estimators under model misspecifications.

Figure 5.1: Estimated Densities of $\eta_{j,t}|\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$




Note. (i) 10,000 sample draws were taken from the density estimates of the Klein-Spady model, and then the density of the drawn sample is plotted. (ii) Klein-Spady model only identifies the distribution of unobservables up to location and scale. Thus, we made the location and scale adjustment. (iii) Density of 10,000 sample draws from the standard Gaussian distribution is plotted for comparison.

Figure 5.1 depicts the estimated densities of $\eta_{j,t}|\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ from the first stage. Although it does not perfectly coincide with the exact density of Type-I extreme value distribution, it preserves the rough shape of the distribution. Much larger sample is needed in order for the estimated densities to fit exactly with the distribution that is used for the data generating process.

Table 1 presents the estimation results of the simulated data. A few remarks are in order. First, the performance of the estimator that we proposed is very good if the model is correctly specified. Even if the functional form of the quality kernel is misspecified, the price coefficient estimates are close to the true parameter. Performance of the estimator is still good when we estimate the model by assuming the joint normality of the error term distribution and use the simple Heckman correction estimator. Next, dropping the sample with zero observed market shares or imputing small positive numbers in place of the zero observed market shares biases the estimators substantially. Lastly, we also generated and estimated several other specifications such as different error term distributions, different functional forms of quality kernels, different variables, different pricing functions, and so on. Although for brevity we did not present all of them here, we note that the results and implications presented in this section were robust. Further details of the estimation procedure can be found in Appendix C.

Table 1: Estimation Result of Simulated Data

| DGP Quality Kernel | $\exp(y)$ | $y$ | $y^2$ | $\exp(y)$ | $y$ | $y^2$ | $\exp(y)$ | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Estimation | Our Model, K/S | | | Heckman Correction | | | Logit, Drop 0 | Logit, Impute $10^{-8}$ |
| Log prices ($-2$) | $-1.969$ | $-1.920$ | $-1.959$ | $-1.972$ | $-1.948$ | $-1.935$ | $-1.287$ | $-5.444$ |
| | (0.128) | (0.039) | (0.072) | (0.119) | (0.051) | (0.089) | (0.074) | (0.372) |
| $x_{j,t}^{(1)}$ (1) | 0.807 | 0.248 | 0.503 | 1.017 | 0.032 | 0.086 | 0.886 | 1.536 |
| | (0.014) | (0.008) | (0.016) | (0.011) | (0.005) | (0.010) | (0.007) | (0.041) |
| $x_{j,t}^{(2)}$ ($-2$) | $-1.635$ | $-0.525$ | $-1.049$ | $-2.045$ | $-0.047$ | $-0.112$ | $-1.574$ | $-3.884$ |
| | (0.028) | (0.015) | (0.030) | (0.035) | (0.024) | (0.045) | (0.013) | (0.050) |
| $x_{j,t}^{(3)}$ (1.5) | 1.222 | 0.391 | 0.778 | 1.530 | 0.020 | 0.086 | 1.339 | 1.821 |
| | (0.020) | (0.010) | (0.022) | (0.023) | (0.014) | (0.027) | (0.008) | (0.040) |
| $x_{j,t}^{(4)}$ (0.3) | 0.251 | 0.064 | 0.128 | 0.290 | $-0.088$ | 0.022 | 0.366 | $-0.468$ |
| | (0.051) | (0.016) | (0.032) | (0.071) | (0.055) | (0.109) | (0.046) | (0.219) |
| $x_{j,t}^{(5)}$ (0.2) | 0.140 | 0.036 | 0.099 | 0.169 | $-0.031$ | $-0.034$ | 0.266 | $-0.673$ |
| | (0.051) | (0.016) | (0.034) | (0.071) | (0.058) | (0.110) | (0.046) | (0.220) |
| $x_{j,t}^{(6)}$ (0.4) | 0.338 | 0.103 | 0.171 | 0.435 | 0.005 | $-0.026$ | 0.458 | $-0.099$ |
| | (0.053) | (0.015) | (0.034) | (0.073) | (0.057) | (0.109) | (0.047) | (0.225) |
| $D$ | 5059 | 4680 | 4593 | 5059 | 4680 | 4593 | 5059 | 10500 |
| $N$ | 10500 | 10557 | 10482 | 10500 | 10557 | 10482 | 5059 | 10500 |

Note. (i) Target values are in the parentheses of the corresponding item in the first column. (ii) The "DGP Quality Kernel" row (row 1) specifies the functional form of the quality kernel used in the data generating process. (iii) The "Estimation" row (row 2) specifies the estimation method used in the estimation. "Our Model, K/S" is our proposed estimator in which the first stage propensity score is estimated using Klein-Spady estimator. For the "Heckman Correction" columns, the Probit is used for the first stage, and the classical Heckman's selection correction estimator with the inverse Mills ratio as an additional regressor is used in the second stage. (iv) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (v) $D$ is the number of noncensored sample, $N$ is the effective sample size.

# 6 Empirical Example: Scanner Data with a Multitude of Zero Shares

In this section, we implement our proposed demand estimation framework to Dominick's supermarket cola sales scanner data. The data is obtained through James M. Kilts Center for Marketing, University of Chicago Booth School of Business. The data contains weekly pricing and sales information of the Dominick's chain stores during 1989-1997, of every UPC-level product in 29 product categories. Promotion statuses and profitability by each unit sold are also recorded in the data. One shortcoming of the data is that there is no systemic record of the product characteristics, which we overcome by choosing the cola sales data and hand-coding the product characteristics.

## 6.1 Data

We choose the Dominick's data since it is ideal for our purpose of illustration for the following two reasons. First, Dominick's data contains the information on which products were displayed in the shelves, even if a product was not sold at all in the corresponding week and store. This feature is necessary for our purpose because we want the exact information of products that were in the consumer's choice set but not chosen at all. Indeed, as presented in Figure 6.1, about 1/4 of the observations exhibit zero observed market shares. Second, Dominick's data contains the information of average profit per each unit sold. Combined with the price data, we can back out the average cost per unit. The cost information is very useful, because an ideal instrument for prices in estimating the consumer demand should be a proxy of cost shocks. We can avoid constructing instruments using indirect proxies for the cost, which has been one of the major difficulties in the demand estimation literature.

We focus on the cola sales for a few reasons. Cola market is a typical market of product differentiation in which many brands are competing with different tastes and packages. Among them two prominent brands, Coke and Pepsi, take the majority of the market shares. Next, the product characteristics are not separately coded in Dominick's data, but only the category information such as "soft drinks" or "bottled juices" are available. We had to extract the information from product descriptions truncated at 30 characters, for which cola is ideal because it has clearly labeled product characteristics. Another reason is that the companies producing cola and the product characteristics of cola have not been changed much for the last few decades. Coke and Pepsi have been two leaders in the market. Diet, cherry-flavored, caffeine-free colas are still sold in the market with considerable market shares in 2016, as well as in 1996. This feature makes our analysis not only convenient, but also the implication of the analysis more realistic. In Appendix D.3 and D.4, we also present the estimation results for laundry detergent demand as a robustness check.

Dominick's data covers 100 chain stores around Chicago area for 400 weeks, from September 1989 to May 1997. We choose the cross-section of week 391, which is the second week of March

1997. We use the cross-section data of a week because we wanted to avoid the following potential problems. First, stockpiling is very common for the products lasting for more than weeks. It is very well documented in the marketing literature that the same consumer will respond more sensitively in terms of the purchasing behavior than in terms of the consumption behavior.[12] Thus, if we use the data across time series, the estimated elasticities can be larger than it actually is. Next, the demand of soft drinks fluctuate in a week with holiday or events such as Super-bowl, and varies considerably by seasons. Therefore we choose a week in March without any close holidays. Because Dominick's experimented with prices across different chain stores for the same product in a same week, we still have enough price variations after choosing a cross-section of data. Even after restricting the sample to a cross-section of one week, the sample size is as large as 4300. We present the summary statistics in Table 2.

We define the individual product and the individual market in a natural way. An individual product is defined by the Universal Product Code (UPC), and a market is defined by the store-week pair. It is the finest way to define the product and the market that our data allows, which results in a multitude of zero observed market shares. As illustrated in Figure 6.1, around one fourth of the products that were actually displayed in the shelves were not sold at all.

[12]Gandhi et al. (2013) use the bath tissue data from same Dominick's database, and they use the time series variation of a single chain store. As a result, their price coefficient estimates are overall smaller than ours; their price coefficient estimates by simply dropping the samples with zero market shares, which should be biased upward, are still negative. However, the implication they draw that the zero observed market shares should not be simply dropped is the same with ours.

Figure 6.1: Histogram of Observed Market Shares



Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

(a) Summary of Product Characteristics in Sample

| | Frequency | Mean | Std |
|---|---|---|---|
| Diet | 2163 | 0.497 | 0.500 |
| Caffeine Free | 1085 | 0.249 | 0.433 |
| Cherry | 151 | 0.035 | 0.183 |
| Coke | 365 | 0.084 | 0.277 |
| Pepsi | 2644 | 0.607 | 0.488 |
| Promo | 1751 | 0.402 | 0.490 |
| Bottle Size | - | 26.592 | 29.696 |
| # Bottles per Bundle | - | 12.436 | 9.667 |
| # Stores | 73 | - | - |
| Uncensored Obs ($D$) | 3226 | - | - |
| Sample Size ($N$) | 4356 | - | - |

(b) Per-ounce Price, Cost, Profitability and Market Shares of Products in Full Sample

| | Mean | Median | Std | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Per-ounce Prices ($) | 0.020 | 0.024 | 0.014 | 0 | 0.042 |
| Per-ounce Cost ($) | 0.014 | 0.017 | 0.010 | 0 | 0.028 |
| Profitability (%) | 20.470 | 28.380 | 160202 | -98.550 | 58.620 |
| Shares (%) | 0.586 | 0.038 | 2.879 | 0 | 42.967 |

(c) Per-ounce Price, Cost, Profitability and Market Shares of Products in Non-censored Sample

| | Mean | Median | Std | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Per-ounce Prices ($) | 0.027 | 0.026 | 0.008 | 0.005 | 0.042 |
| Per-ounce Cost ($) | 0.019 | 0.019 | 0.006 | 0.003 | 0.028 |
| Profitability (%) | 27.640 | 29.180 | 12.499 | -98.550 | 58.620 |
| Shares (%) | 0.791 | 0.084 | 3.321 | 0.001 | 42.967 |

Note. (i) The data is the cross-section of week 391 (03/06/1997-03/12/1997) in the Dominick's scanner data. (ii) Dominick's recorded the price and the cost cost as zero if the sales of the product is zero in the corresponding week. The mean and the median of the price and the cost in Sub-Table (b) are calculated including those zeros.

A few remarks on the data handling are in order. First, we converted the unit prices and the unit costs to per-ounce price and costs, respectively. Next, Dominick's did not record the price and the cost of the week if the sales of the product is zero in the corresponding week. It is the reason why we cannot include the prices in $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$, and proceed only with other exogenous variables in the first stage estimation. Also, in estimating the logit model while substituting the zero observed market shares with small numbers, we need to impute the missing prices and costs using other chain stores' prices and profits with the same product and promotion status. Lastly, we had to compute the market shares of the outside options, both for our model and for the logit demand model.[13] It boils

[13]Although it is not necessary for our model to include the numeraire in the consumer's choice set, we included it

down to the estimation of the market size, for which we assume that an average person consumes 100 ounces of soft drinks a week,[14] and compute the size of the market using the daily customer count data of each store in the chain.

### 6.2 Estimation, Result, and Discussion

We estimate our model using the method we proposed in Section 4. We also estimate the model correcting for the consumer's choice set selection using the Probit as the first-stage estimator, with respectively the Powell (2001) estimator and the simple Heckman selection correction estimator in the second stage. The simple Heckman estimator is implemented using the inverse Mills ratio as an additional regressor as usual. As a benchmark, we estimate the homogenous logit model of demand, with different ways to handle the zero observed market shares: (i) dropping the samples with zero observed market shares, and (ii) substituting zero observed market shares with small numbers. To compare the magnitude of the coefficients, we use the logarithm of prices in the logit model as well. As emphasized before, using the logarithm of prices instead of the raw prices can be regarded as a scale adjustment in the utility specification of the logit demand model.

We estimate two models with different specifications. In the baseline model (Model 1), $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$ includes the following product characteristics: bottle size, number of bottles per bundle, diet, caffeine free, cherry flavor, Coke/Pepsi brand dummies, and the promotion status. As an instrument for the per-ounce price, we use the per-ounce cost calculated from the profitability variable. For Model 1, we use the store-level demographics for the variables included in $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ that are not included in $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$: % blacks and Hispanics, % college graduates, and logarithm of median income. The exclusion assumption on these variables is that a consumer who never buys a certain product will not become an inframarginal consumer no matter what other product characteristics are. For Model 2, we exclude the promotion status from $\mathbf{x}_{j,t}$, and use it as the variable satisfying the exclusion restriction. The exclusion assumption in this case is that the promotion affects only the consumers' information about the choice set, not the level of the utility by consuming a certain product.

The first-stage parameter estimation result for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ is presented in Table 3. Model 1 is the baseline model with store-level demographics in the first-stage. Model 2 uses the promotion statuses as the excluded variables in the second stage estimation. For both Model 1 and Model 2, we estimated the Probit model for benchmark and for setting the initialization value for the nonlinear optimizer to estimate the Klein-Spady model. The coefficients for the Bottle size are normalized to one. We find that the coefficient estimates from Probit estimation and Klein-Spady estimation are considerably different. We also plot the estimated conditional density of $\eta_{j,t}$ given $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ from each model in Figure 6.2. The estimated densities of $\eta_{j,t}$ given $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ is not even unimodal, which we suggest as

because we wanted to compare the estimation results of our model to those of the logit model in the exactly same setup.

[14] On average, Americans consume around 45 gallons of soft drinks a year. Source: http://adage.com/article/news/consumers-drink-soft-drinks-water-beer/228422/.

a strong evidence that the unobservable product characteristics $\eta_{j,t}$ does not follow the Gaussian distribution.

The main estimation result is presented in Table 4, which is striking. In logit demand models, the coefficients of the logarithm of prices are positive, economically and statistically very significant, even after instrumenting for the prices using the supplier side cost information. In contrast, log-linear estimation of our model with Klein-Spady first stage estimator returns the expected signs and magnitudes for the coefficients of the logarithm of prices. It is also surprising that the estimators assuming the standard Gaussian distribution on the unobservables performs very well, despite the fact that the estimated distributions of the unobservables are far from Gaussian. We conjecture that such a good performance of models assuming normality is because the estimated propensity scores from the Klein-Spady model and Probit model turn out to be highly correlated, with the correlation coefficient around 0.7 for both Model 1 and Model 2. Although this pattern is consistent in all the robustness checks that are presented in Appendix D, we are unsure whether it can be generalized to a different dataset or to a different market.

The result provides a very strong evidence of the choice set selection process which has been ignored in the demand estimation literature thus far. Recall the estimation equation (4.2) under the exponential quality kernel:

$$E\left[\ln\left(\frac{\pi_{j,t}}{\pi_{0,t}}\right)|\mathbf{z}_{j,t},\mathbf{w}_{j,t},\pi_{j,t}>0\right]=-\sigma\phi_{j,t}+\mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta}+E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t},\mathbf{w}_{j,t},\pi_{j,t}>0\right].$$

Except for the term $E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t},\mathbf{w}_{j,t},\pi_{j,t}>0\right]$, the estimation equation is the same with the logit demand model when we drop the samples with zero observed market shares. That is, Column 1 (Our Model, K/S, Model 1) and Column 7 (Logit Model, Drop 0) should exactly coincide when the term $E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t},\mathbf{w}_{j,t},\pi_{j,t}>0\right]$ is zero. Yet, it turns out that it is not the case. As shown in Table 4, ignoring the consumer's choice set selection process biases the estimates, even resulting in an upward-sloping demand curve. It lines up with the intuition of Heckman (1979): when the sample selection is ignored the whole estimates from a regression can be misleading. To be specific, in our case $E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t},\mathbf{w}_{j,t},\pi_{j,t}>0\right]$ is likely to be positive. This is because the consumers will select on unobservables $\eta_{j,t}$ as well as observables $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$, and $\eta_{j,t}$ is highly correlated with $\xi_{j,t}$. Hence, even after instrumenting for the prices, the price coefficient estimates are likely to be biased upward when the samples with zero observed market shares are just dropped. Imputing some small numbers on zero observed market shares may cause a more serious problem, that the direction of the bias cannot be predicted. In contrast to Table 1 in the previous section, in Table 4 we observe that imputing zero observed market shares with small positive numbers causes an upward bias in the price coefficient estimates. Indeed, we do not have an explanation on the direction of the bias when zeros are imputed.

In Appendix D, we also present the estimation results for the cola data from different weeks,

and for the laundry detergent data. All the results in Appendix D exhibit the same pattern as in Table 4, which suggest that our findings are robust.

Figure 6.2: Estimated Densities of $\eta_{j,t}|\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$




Note. (i) 10,000 sample draws were taken from the density estimates of the Klein-Spady model, and then the density of the drawn sample is plotted. (ii) Klein-Spady model only identifies the distribution of unobservables up to location and scale. Thus, we normalized so that $E\left[\eta_{j,t}|\mathbf{w}_{j,t}\right] = 0$ and $Var\left(\eta_{j,t}|\mathbf{w}_{j,t}\right) = 4$. (iii) Density of 10,000 sample draws from the standard Gaussian distribution is plotted for comparison.

Table 3: First-stage Parameter Estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ | Probit | Klein-Spady | Probit | Klein-Spady |
| Bottle Size | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | (0.196) | (−) | (0.195) | (−) |
| # Bottles per Bundle | −1.453 | −133.500 | −1.431 | −91.991 |
| | (0.330) | (12.535) | (0.329) | (3.780) |
| Diet | 18.222 | −515.187 | 18.342 | −277.300 |
| | (4.822) | (50.981) | (4.818) | (12.238) |
| Caffeine Free | −13.663 | 118.946 | −13.619 | 149.733 |
| | (6.171) | (4.446) | (6.158) | (10.108) |
| Cherry | −53.582 | −22.960 | −53.619 | 19.536 |
| | (13.805) | (4.620) | (13.821) | (4.700) |
| Coke | −41.915 | 91.351 | −41.949 | −20.901 |
| | (10.209) | (4.797) | (10.192) | (3.607) |
| Pepsi | 79.904 | −170.295 | 79.989 | −70.255 |
| | (5.910) | (8.323) | (5.917) | (2.492) |
| Promo | 135.534 | 601.361 | 135.449 | 396.440 |
| | (8.686) | (53.123) | (8.679) | (18.234) |
| % Blacks and Hispanics | −29.891 | −6.454 | - | - |
| | (21.430) | (13.069) | | |
| % College Graduates | 3.850 | 4.550 | - | - |
| | (20.978) | (12.624) | | |
| Log Median Income | −16.888 | 26.399 | - | - |
| | (93.441) | (43.820) | | |
| $D$ | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 |
| $N$ | 4356 | 4356 | 4356 | 4356 |

Note. (i) $D$ is the number of nonzero market shares observations and $N$ is the sample size. (ii) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (iii) Unit of bottle size is liquid ounces. (iv) We normalized the coefficients of Bottle Size to one.

Table 4: Second-stage Parameter Estimates $\left(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)$

| | Our Model, K/S | | Our Model, Probit | | Heckman Correction | | Logit Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t})$ | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Drop 0 | $10^{-8}$ | $10^{-4}$ |
| Log Price ($-\sigma$) | −1.375 | −1.331 | −1.142 | −1.140 | −1.295 | −1.304 | 4.656 | 7.042 | 4.519 |
| | (0.040) | (0.041) | (0.061) | (0.058) | (0.041) | (0.040) | (0.094) | (0.143) | (0.069) |
| Bottle Size | 0.009 | 0.011 | 0.021 | 0.020 | 0.011 | 0.013 | 0.110 | 0.174 | 0.103 |
| | (0.001) | (0.002) | (0.019) | (0.010) | (0.002) | (0.001) | (0.004) | (0.006) | (0.003) |
| # Bottles per Bundle | 0.060 | 0.167 | 0.171 | 0.176 | 0.136 | 0.130 | 0.336 | 0.423 | 0.302 |
| | (0.025) | (0.010) | (0.010) | (0.019) | (0.006) | (0.003) | (0.012) | (0.019) | (0.009) |
| Diet | 0.207 | 0.361 | −0.316 | −0.350 | −0.219 | −0.186 | 0.878 | 1.955 | 0.844 |
| | (0.124) | (0.072) | (0.112) | (0.160) | (0.056) | (0.045) | (0.113) | (0.187) | (0.091) |
| Caffeine Free | −1.198 | −1.369 | −1.104 | −1.104 | −1.052 | −1.072 | −2.235 | −3.228 | −1.961 |
| | (0.054) | (0.058) | (0.116) | (0.178) | (0.063) | (0.056) | (0.126) | (0.209) | (0.101) |
| Cherry | −2.927 | −2.990 | −3.085 | −3.086 | −2.139 | −2.232 | −3.531 | −5.451 | −2.943 |
| | (0.132) | (0.123) | (1.071) | (0.835) | (0.185) | (0.176) | (0.329) | (0.485) | (0.235) |
| Coke | −0.181 | −0.375 | −0.729 | −0.828 | 0.071 | 0.063 | 0.533 | 0.087 | 0.118 |
| | (0.115) | (0.103) | (0.549) | (0.255) | (0.113) | (0.102) | (0.242) | (0.361) | (0.175) |
| Pepsi | 1.699 | 1.644 | 1.120 | 0.977 | 0.868 | 1.068 | 4.397 | 8.500 | 4.177 |
| | (0.066) | (0.069) | (0.962) | (0.191) | (0.191) | (0.062) | (0.164) | (0.244) | (0.118) |
| Promo | 0.671 | - | 0.168 | - | −0.260 | - | 0.886 | 3.373 | 1.122 |
| | (0.130) | | (1.446) | | (0.233) | | (0.129) | (0.208) | (0.101) |
| $D$ | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 4090 | 4090 |
| $N$ | 4356 | 4356 | 4356 | 4356 | 4356 | 4356 | 3226 | 4090 | 4090 |

Note. (i) For columns "Our Model, K/S" and "Our Model, Probit," results from Klein-Spady and Probit estimators in Table 3 are used for the first-stage estimator, respectively, and then the pairwise differenced weighted instrumental variables estimator is used in the second stage. For the "Heckman Correction" column, the Probit is used in the first stage, and the Heckman's selection correction estimator with the inverse Mills ratio as an additional regressor is used in the second stage. (ii) $D$ is the number of nonzero market shares observations, $N$ is the effective sample size. (iii) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (iv) Unit of bottle size is liquid ounces. (v) Because Dominick's did not record the price and cost when sales is zero, in estimating "$10^{-8}$" column and "$10^{-4}$" column, we had to use the average prices and costs of the same product with the same promotion statuses of other stores.

# 7 Conclusion

We developed a semiparametric demand estimation framework based on the Marshallian demand function derived from the budget constrained CES utility maximization problem. Our framework is rich enough to incorporate the observed and unobserved product characteristics, and it is compatible with the widely used homogenous and random coefficients logit models of demand. Furthermore, it can accommodate the zero predicted and observed market shares with a reasonable microfoundation by separating the intensive margin and extensive margin, and embedding them both in the quality kernel that we have introduced. A breakthrough we made was to account for the selection of the consumer's choice set, which has not been recognized in the literature thus far. If the choice set selection problem is ignored, the estimates of the price coefficients can be misleading not only in their magnitudes but also in their signs. We have demonstrated in our empirical application that it can even result in an upward sloping demand curve.

A direct extension of our work will be the random coefficients demand estimation framework which can accommodate the zero predicted and observed market shares. When the representative agent is assumed, the own and cross price elasticities derived from our model also exhibit the unrealistic substitution patterns, as in the homogenous logit demand model of Berry (1994). Overcoming such unrealistic substitution patterns was one of the most important motivations in the development of the random coefficients logit model of demand by Berry et al. (1995). Although we provide the microfoundation for the random coefficients within our demand estimation framework, we did not develop the identification and estimation of the model parameters with random coefficients that can accommodate the zero market shares. We leave such an extension as a future research agenda.

## References


Ackerberg, D., C. L. Benkard, S. Berry, and A. Pakes (2007): *Econometric tools for analyzing market outcomes*, Elsevier, vol. 6A of *Handbook of Econometrics*, chap. 63, 4171–4276.

Aguirregabiria, V. and A. Nevo (2013): *Recent developments in empirical IO*, Cambridge University Press, vol. 3 of *Advances in Economics and Econometrics*, chap. 2, 53–122.

Ahn, H. and J. L. Powell (1993): "Semiparametric estimation of censored selection models with a nonparametric selection mechanism," *Journal of Econometrics*, 58, 3–29.

Anderson, S. P., A. de Palma, and J.-F. Thisse (1987): "The CES is a discrete choice model?" *Economics Letters*, 24, 139–140.

Bajari, P. and C. L. Benkard (2005): "Demand estimation with heterogeneous consumers and unobserved product characteristics: A hedonic approach," *Journal of Political Economy*, 113, 1239–1276.

Berry, S. (1994): "Estimating discrete-choice models of product differentiation," *RAND Journal of Economics*, 25, 242–262.

Berry, S., A. Gandhi, and P. Haile (2013): "Connected substitutes and invertibility of demand," *Econometrica*, 81, 2087–2111.

Berry, S., J. Levinsohn, and A. Pakes (1995): "Automobile prices in market equilibrium," *Econometrica*, 63, 841–890.

Berry, S. and A. Pakes (2007): "The pure characteristics demand model," *International Economic Review*, 48, 1193–1225.

Blundell, R. and J. L. Powell (2007): "Censored regression quantiles with endogenous regressors," *Journal of Econometrics*, 141, 65–83.

Blundell, R. W. and J. L. Powell (2003): *Endogeneity in nonparametric and semiparametric regression models*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, vol. 2 of *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Theory and Applications, Eighth World Congress*, chap. 8, 312–357.

——— (2004): "Endogeneity in semiparametric binary response models," *Review of Economic Studies*, 71, 655–679.

Broda, C. and D. E. Weinstein (2006): "Globalization and the gains from variety," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121, 541–585.

Bronnenberg, B. J. (2015): "The provision of convenience and variety by the market," *RAND Journal of Economics*, 46, 480–498.

Chiang, J. (1991): "A simultaneous approach to the whether, what and how much to buy questions," *Marketing Science*, 10, 297–315.

Chintagunta, P. K. (1993): "Investigating purchase incidence, brand choice and purchase quantity decisions of households," *Marketing Scinece*, 12, 184–208.

Dixit, A. K. and J. E. Stiglitz (1977): "Monopolistic competition and optimum product diversity," *American Economic Review*, 67, 297–308.

Dube, J.-P., J. T. Fox, and C.-L. Su (2012): "Improving the numerical performance of static and dynamic aggregate discrete choice random coefficients demand estimation," *Econometrica*, 80, 2231–2267.

Einav, L., D. Knoepfle, J. Levin, and N. Sundaresan (2014): "Sales taxes and internet commerce," *American Economic Review*, 104, 1–26.

Feenstra, R. C. (1994): "New product varieties and the measurement of international prices," *American Economic Review*, 84, 157–177.

Gandhi, A., Z. Lu, and X. Shi (2013): "Estimating demand for differentiated products with error in market shares," Working Paper.

Handbury, J. (2013): "Are poor cities cheap for everyone?: Non-homotheticity and the cost of living across U.S. cities," Working Paper.

Handbury, J. and D. E. Weinstein (2014): "Goods prices and availability in cities," *Review of Economic Studies*, 82, 258–296.

Hanemann, W. M. (1984): "Discrete/continuous models of consumer demand," *Econometrica*, 52, 541–561.

Heckman, J. J. (1979): "Sample selection bias as a specification error," *Econometrica*, 47, 153–62.

Helpman, E., M. Melitz, and Y. Rubinstein (2008): "Estimating trade flows: Trading partners and trading volumes," *Quarterly Journal of Eonomics*, 123, 441–487.

Honoré, B. E., E. Kyriazidou, and C. Udry (1997): "Estimation of Type 3 Tobit models using symmetric trimming and pairwise comparisons," *Journal of Econometrics*, 76, 107–128.

Joo, J. and K. Kim (2016): "Are Generalized Extreme Value class discrete choice demand models reationalizable as a representative consumer's behavior?" *Working Paper*.

Klein, R. W. and R. H. Spady (1993): "An efficient semiparametric estimator for binary response models," *Econometrica*, 61, 387–421.

Krugman, P. (1980): "Scale economies, product differentiation, and the pattern of trade," *American Economic Review*, 70, 950–959.

Li, N. (2013): "An Engel curve for variety," Working Paper.

Nair, H., J.-P. Dubé, and P. Chintagunta (2005): "Accounting for primary and secondary demand effects with aggregate data," *Marketing Science*, 24, 444–460.

Nevo, A. (2000): "A practitioner's guide to estimation of random-coefficients logit models of demand," *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 9, 513–548.

——— (2001): "Measuring market power in the ready-to-eat cereal industry," *Econometrica*, 69, 307–342.

——— (2011): "Empirical models of consumer behavior," *Annual Review of Economics*, 3, 51–75.

Newey, W. K. (2009): "Two-step series estimation of sample selection models," *Econometrics Journal*, 12, S217–S229.

Newey, W. K. and D. McFadden (1994): *Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, vol. 4 of *Handbook of Econometrics*, chap. 36, 2111–2245.

Petrin, A. (2002): "Quantifying the benefits of new products: The case of the minivan," *Journal of Political Economy*, 110, 705–729.

Powell, J. L. (1984): "Least absolute deviations estimation for the censored regression model," *Journal of Econometrics*, 25, 303–325.

——— (1986): "Censored regression quantiles," *Journal of Econometrics*, 32, 143–155.

——— (2001): *Semiparametric estimation of censored selection models*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chap. 6, 165–196.

Reiss, P. C. and F. A. Wolak (2007): *Structural econometric modeling: Rationales and examples from industrial organization*, Elsevier, vol. 6A of *Handbook of Econometrics*, chap. 64, 4277–4415.

Rothe, C. (2009): "Semiparametric estimation of binary response models with endogenous regressors," *Journal of Econometrics*, 153, 51–64.

Spence, M. (1976): "Product selection, fixed costs, and monopolistic competition," *Review of Economic Studies*, 43, 217–235.

# A Derivation of the Logit Demand System

In this section, the derivation of the homogenous and random coefficients logit demand systems is illustrated. The illustration in this section mostly follows the original presentation of Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995).

Let $j \in \mathcal{J}_t$, where $\mathcal{J}_t$ is a finite set of alternatives which must contain the numeraire. Individual $i$ in market $t$ solves the following discrete choice utility maximization problem:

$$\max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_t} \{u_{i,j,t}\},$$

where the utility of choosing alternative $j$ in market $t$ is given by:

$$u_{i,j,t} = \alpha_i (y_i - p_{j,t}) + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta}_i + \xi_{j,t} + \epsilon_{i,j,t}. \tag{A.1}$$

$\epsilon_{i,j,t}$ follows the i.i.d. Type-I extreme value distribution. Although the original specification of $u_{i,j,t}$ by Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995) is linear in prices, it is also legitimate to specify the utility as:

$$u_{i,j,t} = \alpha_i (\ln y_i - \ln p_{j,t}) + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta}_i + \xi_{j,t} + \epsilon_{i,j,t},$$

given the interpretation that $u_{i,j,t}$ is a direct utility of individual $i$ choosing alternative $j$ in market $t$. Taking the logarithms can be regarded as a scale adjustment on the level of disutility from prices.

The coefficients $(\alpha_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)$ may vary over individuals. They are specified as the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i &:= \alpha + \Pi_\alpha \mathbf{q}_i + \Sigma_\alpha v_{\alpha,i} \\
\boldsymbol{\beta}_i &:= \boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\Pi}_\beta \mathbf{q}_i + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta \mathbf{v}_{\beta,i},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{q}_i$ is demographic variables, $\mathbf{v}_i$ is a vector of unit normal shock, $(\Pi_\alpha, \boldsymbol{\Pi}_\beta)$ is a correlation component between demographic variables and the corresponding coefficients, and $(\Sigma_\alpha, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta)$ represents the covariance structure of the shocks on the coefficients. The linear utility specification (A.1) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{i,j,t} &= \alpha_i (y_i - p_{j,t}) + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta}_i + \xi_{j,t} + \epsilon_{i,j,t} \\
&= \alpha_i y_i - (\alpha + \Pi_\alpha \mathbf{q}_i + \Sigma_\alpha v_{\alpha,i}) p_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}_{j,t} (\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\Pi}_\beta \mathbf{q}_i + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta \mathbf{v}_{\beta,i}) + \xi_{j,t} + \epsilon_{i,j,t} \\
&= \alpha_i y_i + \left(-\alpha p_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \xi_{j,t}\right) - (\Pi_\alpha \mathbf{q}_i + \Sigma_\alpha v_{\alpha,i}) p_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t} (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_\beta \mathbf{q}_i + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta \mathbf{v}_{\beta,i}) + \epsilon_{i,j,t} \\
&= \alpha_i y_i + \left(-\alpha p_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \xi_{j,t}\right) + \begin{pmatrix} -p_{j,t} & \mathbf{x}'_{j,t} \end{pmatrix} (\boldsymbol{\Pi}\mathbf{q}_i + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{v}_i) + \epsilon_{i,j,t} \\
&=: \alpha_i y_i + \delta_{j,t} + \mu_{i,j,t} + \epsilon_{i,j,t},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{j,t}$ is the mean utility of alternative $j$ that is common to every individual in market $t$, and $\mu_{i,j,t}$ is the individual specific structural utility component. For the log-linear specification, one can

simply replace the term $p_{j,t}$ with $\ln p_{j,t}$.

Given the assumption that $\epsilon_{i,j,t}$ follows i.i.d. Type-I extreme value distribution, the individual choice probability $\Pr(i \to j|t)$ becomes:

$$\Pr(i \to j|t) = \frac{\exp(\delta_{j,t} + \mu_{i,j,t})}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_t} \exp(\delta_{k,t} + \mu_{i,k,t})}.$$

This individual choice probability is taken as the individual predicted quantity share $\pi_{i,j,t}$. Given the distributions of the demographics $F(\mathbf{z}_i)$ and of the shocks on the preference parameters $F(\mathbf{v}_i)$, the predicted quantity market share of good $j$ is aggregated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{j,t} &= \int\int \pi_{i,j,t} dF(\mathbf{z}_i)\, dF(\mathbf{v}_i) \\ &= \int\int \frac{\exp(\delta_{j,t} + \mu_{i,j,t})}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_t} \exp(\delta_{k,t} + \mu_{i,k,t})} dF(\mathbf{z}_i)\, dF(\mathbf{v}_i). \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

If $\alpha_i = \alpha$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i = \boldsymbol{\beta}$, which implies that there is no heterogeneity of preference parameters across individuals, the model reduces to the homogenous logit demand model.

By definition, the predicted market share $\pi_{j,t}$ is:

$$\pi_{j,t} := \frac{q_{j,t}}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_t} q_{k,t}}.$$

This system of predicted quantity market shares for $\#(\mathcal{J}_t)$ alternatives in a market $t$ provides only $\#(\mathcal{J}_t) - 1$ linear restrictions on the system of quantity demand $\mathbf{q}_t$. An additional restriction is required, and Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995) impose the fixed market size assumption to derive the quantity demand, i.e., the denominator $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_t} q_{k,t}$ is taken as fixed at some level $M$.

# B Derivation of the Selection-Correction Estimation Equation from the Two-stage Discrete Choice Models

In this section, we show that the estimation equation (4.2) can be derived from a two-stage decision process from the logit demand model. Consider a representative consumer with two-stage decision process. In the first stage, the consumer makes a search over $\mathcal{J}_t$, which is all the possible alternatives. The consumer's choice set $\mathcal{J}_t^+$ is determined as a result of the search. In the second stage, the consumer encounters the usual discrete choice decision problem over $\mathcal{J}_t^+$, i.e., purchase the product that yields the highest utility.

Let $(\mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \eta_{j,t})$ be the variables that affect the first-stage choice set search, $(\mathbf{x}_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t})$ be the variables that affect the second-stage discrete choice unconstrained utility maximization problem. Notice that these form an analogue of the notations we used in Sections 3 and 4. Let us model the threshold decision rule of the search for the choice set as $d_{j,t} = \mathbf{1}\left(\left\{\gamma + \mathbf{w}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\delta} + \eta_{j,t} > 0\right\}\right)$, where

$d_{j,t} = 1$ denotes the product $j$ in market $t$ is contained in the consumer's choice set $\mathcal{J}_t^+$. The second stage utility of the consumer is modeled as

$$u_{i,j,t} = -\alpha \ln p_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \xi_{j,t} + \epsilon_{i,j,t}.$$

The representative consumer solves

$$\max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_t^+} \{u_{j,t}\}.$$

With the i.i.d. Type-I extreme value assumption on $\epsilon_{i,j,t}$'s, the individual choice probability becomes:

$$\Pr(i \to j|t) = \frac{\exp\left(-\alpha \ln p_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \xi_{j,t}\right)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_t^+} \exp\left(-\alpha \ln p_{k,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{k,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \xi_{k,t}\right)}.$$

$\Pr(i \to j|t)$ is taken as the predicted quantity market shares $\pi_{j,t}$, and then in the estimation $\pi_{j,t}$ is equated with the observed market shares $s_{j,t}$. The inversion theorem of Berry (1994); Berry et al. (1995) applies. The only difference is again the moment condition; $E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}, \mathcal{J}_t^+\right]$ is not zero, and it is highly likely to be positive. Thus, there has to be a correction term for the selection on the choice set, which leads us to the following estimation equation:

$$E\left[\ln\left(\frac{\pi_{j,t}}{\pi_{0,t}}\right)|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \mathcal{J}_t^+\right] = -\alpha \ln p_{j,t} + \mathbf{x}'_{j,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + E\left[\xi_{j,t}|\mathbf{z}_{j,t}, \mathbf{w}_{j,t}, \mathcal{J}_t^+\right]. \tag{B.1}$$

(B.1) coincides with (4.2).

# C Implementation Details

Throughout the estimation process, we use the Gaussian kernel for both first and second stage estimation. For tractability, higher order kernels are not used. The bandwidth $h_n$ for the Klein-Spady estimator is $h_n = \text{std}\left(\mathbf{w}'_j \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\text{Probit}}\right) C_1 n^{-\frac{1}{7}}$. The rate $n^{-\frac{1}{7}}$ follows the original suggestion of Klein and Spady (1993). The bandwidth for the second-stage Powell (2001) estimator is $h_n = \text{std}\left(\mathbf{w}'_j \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\text{KS}}\right) C_2 n^{-\frac{1}{7}}$ where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\text{KS}}$ is the Klein-Spady estimator from the first-stage. We use the tuning parameter $C_1 = C_2 = 1$ in Section 5, and $C_1 = C_2 = 0.5$ in Section 6.

We tried 100 randomly generated starting values in the first-stage Klein-Spady estimation to guard against the argument that the optimization routine stopped at local minima. The randomly generated initial values follow the distribution $\mathcal{N}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\text{Probit}}, \frac{1}{5}\text{diag}\left(\sqrt{\left|\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\text{Probit}}\right|}\right)\right)$. We also tried several different tuning parameters to check robustness. While the first-stage estimates vary with respect to the choice of the tuning parameters and the bandwidth, the second-stage estimates, which are of our main interest, are very robust to the choice of bandwidth and the choice of initial values for the nonlinear optimization.

For the simple Heckman estimator with endogeneity, we computed standard errors which take

into account the fact that the inverse Mills ratio is a generated regressor. Details on the covariance formula of the estimator can be found in Newey and McFadden (1994). Because finding the inverse Mills ratio is quite fast, one can also consider using the bootstrapped standard errors for the Heckman estimator.

Lastly, we tried both IPOPT and KNITRO for the nonlinear optimization, which are the state-of-art derivative based nonlinear optimizers. The results were robust to the choice of optimizer.

# D Robustness Checks

## D.1 Cola Demand for Week 382

In this subsection, we estimate the same models as in Section 6, with the cola data from a different week. We use the data of week 382 (from January 1 to 9, 1997). In Tables 5 and 6, we repeat the estimation procedure for Tables 3 and 4.

Table 5: First-stage Parameter Estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ | Probit | Klein-Spady | Probit | Klein-Spady |
| Bottle Size | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | (0.193) | (−) | (0.188) | (−) |
| # Bottles per Bundle | −5.825 | −157.181 | −5.867 | −46.247 |
| | (0.426) | (23.221) | (0.429) | (12.736) |
| Diet | 14.674 | 5.802 | 14.892 | 7.834 |
| | (4.986) | (5.447) | (5.016) | (3.170) |
| Caffeine Free | −22.501 | −335.901 | −22.949 | 43.032 |
| | (5.938) | (44.885) | (5.971) | (4.613) |
| Cherry | −69.030 | −188.603 | −68.882 | −231.403 |
| | (11.635) | (23.457) | (11.761) | (71.908) |
| Coke | 70.572 | 262.402 | 70.670 | 122.727 |
| | (9.577) | (33.91) | (9.636) | (17.578) |
| Pepsi | 47.706 | 377.354 | 48.249 | −150.090 |
| | (5.839) | (45.846) | (5.888) | (56.156) |
| Promo | 124.981 | 1007.944 | 126.413 | 866.065 |
| | (7.633) | (139.527) | (7.699) | (229.737) |
| % Blacks and Hispanics | 24.100 | 30.682 | - | - |
| | (22.881) | (23.885) | | |
| % College Graduates | −45.023 | −66.658 | - | - |
| | (22.069) | (21.641) | | |
| Log Median Income | −284.144 | −226.55 | - | - |
| | (100.267) | (100.23) | | |
| $D$ | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 |
| $N$ | 4337 | 4337 | 4337 | 4337 |

Note. (i) $D$ is the number of nonzero market shares observations and $N$ is the sample size. (ii) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (iii) Unit of bottle size is liquid ounces. (iv) We normalized the coefficients of Bottle Size to one.

Table 6: Second-stage Parameter Estimates $\left(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)$

| | Our Model, K/S | | Our Model, Probit | | Heckman Correction | | Logit Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t})$ | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Drop 0 | $10^{-8}$ | $10^{-4}$ |
| Log Price ($-\sigma$) | −1.254 | −1.175 | −1.318 | −1.266 | −1.339 | −1.272 | 4.384 | 5.299 | 4.040 |
| | (0.035) | (0.039) | (0.038) | (0.045) | (0.038) | (0.041) | (0.131) | (0.166) | (0.085) |
| Bottle Size | 0.009 | 0.010 | −0.002 | −0.003 | 0.002 | −0.002 | 0.104 | 0.122 | 0.091 |
| | (0.002) | (0.004) | (0.003) | (0.006) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.005) | (0.007) | (0.004) |
| # Bottles per Bundle | −0.001 | 0.053 | 0.011 | 0.046 | −0.018 | 0.036 | 0.226 | 0.114 | 0.170 |
| | (0.009) | (0.003) | (0.014) | (0.004) | (0.004) | (0.003) | (0.017) | (0.022) | (0.011) |
| Diet | −0.127 | −0.114 | −0.119 | −0.113 | −0.155 | −0.275 | 1.164 | 1.457 | 0.921 |
| | (0.032) | (0.036) | (0.042) | (0.087) | (0.035) | (0.048) | (0.135) | (0.191) | (0.098) |
| Caffeine Free | −1.215 | −1.108 | −1.111 | −1.148 | −1.146 | −0.851 | −1.805 | −2.990 | −1.682 |
| | (0.041) | (0.053) | (0.054) | (0.114) | (0.040) | (0.053) | (0.137) | (0.200) | (0.102) |
| Cherry | −1.889 | −2.222 | −1.749 | −1.772 | −1.696 | −0.725 | −3.056 | −6.164 | −2.887 |
| | (0.105) | (0.272) | (0.132) | (0.324) | (0.120) | (0.218) | (0.412) | (0.478) | (0.244) |
| Coke | 1.461 | 1.670 | 1.271 | 1.415 | 1.178 | 0.445 | 3.244 | 5.440 | 2.778 |
| | (0.113) | (0.136) | (0.135) | (0.392) | (0.098) | (0.123) | (0.260) | (0.357) | (0.183) |
| Pepsi | 0.942 | 0.844 | 0.917 | 1.045 | 0.798 | 0.289 | 3.518 | 5.470 | 2.987 |
| | (0.062) | (0.126) | (0.079) | (0.237) | (0.052) | (0.069) | (0.199) | (0.262) | (0.134) |
| Promo | 1.510 | - | 0.645 | - | 1.256 | - | 0.643 | 2.414 | 0.736 |
| | (0.063) | | (0.257) | | (0.066) | | (0.141) | (0.207) | (0.106) |
| $D$ | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 3226 | 4118 | 4118 |
| $N$ | 4337 | 4337 | 4337 | 4337 | 4337 | 4337 | 3226 | 4118 | 4118 |

Note. (i) For columns "Our Model, K/S" and "Our Model, Probit," results from Klein-Spady and Probit estimators in Table 5 are used for the first-stage estimator, respectively, and then the pairwise differenced weighted instrumental variables estimator is used in the second stage. For the "Heckman Correction" column, the Probit is used in the first stage, and the Heckman's selection correction estimator with the inverse Mills ratio as an additional regressor is used in the second stage. (ii) $D$ is the number of nonzero market shares observations, $N$ is the effective sample size. (iii) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (iv) Unit of bottle size is liquid ounces. (v) Because Dominick's did not record the price and cost when sales is zero, in estimating "$10^{-8}$" column and "$10^{-4}$" column, we had to use the average prices and costs of the same product with the same promotion statuses of other stores.

## D.2 Cola Demand for Week 278

We repeat the estimation procedure for the cola data of week 278 (from January 5 to 11, 1995). It turns out that all the results show the same pattern as in the previous sections. Although not tabulated here, we also examined the data from many other weeks and the results were robust.

Table 7: First-stage Parameter Estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ | Probit | Klein-Spady | Probit | Klein-Spady |
| Bottle Size | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | (0.169) | (−) | (0.170) | (−) |
| # Bottles per Bundle | −5.289 | −68.799 | −5.334 | −166.569 |
| | (0.487) | (5.218) | (0.489) | (140.200) |
| Diet | −75.673 | −207.218 | −76.147 | −1520.618 |
| | (6.774) | (15.787) | (6.761) | (1289.560) |
| Caffeine Free | 75.038 | 252.376 | 74.187 | 1565.247 |
| | (8.743) | (18.212) | (8.674) | (1292.587) |
| Cherry | −224.050 | −1406.267 | −223.710 | −255.074 |
| | (107.821) | (106.027) | (108.580) | (12145.276) |
| Coke | 152.293 | 1460.142 | 151.949 | 83.965 |
| | (17.382) | (106.708) | (17.472) | (6.953) |
| Pepsi | 18.103 | 92.893 | 18.408 | −751.111 |
| | (7.046) | (5.724) | (7.076) | (643.282) |
| Promo | 303.695 | 2118.076 | 305.656 | 4718.847 |
| | (7.697) | (156.271) | (7.716) | (3869.202) |
| % Blacks and Hispanics | 1.897 | 20.684 | - | - |
| | (25.054) | (22.897) | | |
| % College Graduates | −60.347 | −44.537 | - | - |
| | (27.667) | (21.267) | | |
| Log Median Income | −213.245 | −103.183 | - | - |
| | (112.231) | (92.389) | | |
| $D$ | 3667 | 3667 | 3667 | 3667 |
| $N$ | 5185 | 5185 | 5185 | 5185 |

Note. (i) $D$ is the number of nonzero market shares observations and $N$ is the sample size. (ii) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (iii) Unit of bottle size is liquid ounces. (iv) We normalized the coefficients of Bottle Size to one.

Table 8: Second-stage Parameter Estimates $\left(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)$

| | Our Model, K/S | | Our Model, Probit | | Heckman Correction | | Logit Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t})$ | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Drop 0 | $10^{-8}$ | $10^{-4}$ |
| Log Price $(-\sigma)$ | −1.225 | −0.918 | −0.261 | −0.261 | −0.991 | −0.969 | 23.669 | 22.774 | 18.042 |
| | (0.068) | (0.176) | (0.117) | (0.110) | (0.043) | (0.040) | (5.078) | (3.272) | (2.592) |
| Bottle Size | 0.000 | 0.008 | 0.017 | 0.028 | 0.012 | 0.013 | 0.869 | 0.857 | 0.681 |
| | (0.002) | (0.001) | (0.005) | (0.003) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.197) | (0.135) | (0.107) |
| # Bottles per Bundle | −0.018 | 0.047 | 0.153 | 0.097 | 0.057 | 0.054 | 2.271 | 2.200 | 1.795 |
| | (0.019) | (0.006) | (0.026) | (0.012) | (0.003) | (0.003) | (0.512) | (0.357) | (0.283) |
| Diet | 0.088 | −0.213 | 0.826 | 0.007 | −0.070 | −0.127 | 4.408 | 4.422 | 3.243 |
| | (0.064) | (0.094) | (0.404) | (0.124) | (0.042) | (0.037) | (1.336) | (0.979) | (0.775) |
| Caffeine Free | −1.536 | −1.437 | −2.364 | −1.554 | −1.319 | −1.281 | −5.282 | −6.027 | −5.408 |
| | (0.070) | (0.106) | (0.417) | (0.108) | (0.045) | (0.043) | (1.025) | (0.972) | (0.770) |
| Cherry | −4.157 | −2.820 | −0.268 | −2.672 | −2.892 | −3.018 | −3.918 | −3.949 | −3.887 |
| | (0.472) | (18.229) | (3.573) | (2.073) | (0.351) | (0.312) | (7.265) | (6.981) | (5.529) |
| Coke | 2.631 | 1.802 | 0.252 | 1.833 | 1.633 | 1.684 | 3.923 | 6.317 | 4.372 |
| | (0.377) | (0.509) | (0.600) | (0.186) | (0.109) | (0.106) | (1.437) | (1.325) | (1.050) |
| Pepsi | 1.456 | 1.366 | 1.275 | 1.446 | 1.471 | 1.464 | 13.673 | 16.056 | 12.862 |
| | (0.054) | (0.081) | (0.130) | (0.082) | (0.044) | (0.044) | (3.222) | (2.693) | (2.133) |
| Promo | 0.294 | - | −3.216 | - | −0.331 | - | 18.601 | 14.647 | 10.021 |
| | (0.466) | | (1.264) | | (0.128) | | (4.562) | (2.177) | (1.724) |
| $D$ | 3667 | 3667 | 3667 | 3667 | 3667 | 3667 | 3667 | 4069 | 4069 |
| $N$ | 5185 | 5185 | 5185 | 5185 | 5185 | 5185 | 3667 | 4069 | 4069 |

Note. (i) For columns "Our Model, K/S" and "Our Model, Probit," results from Klein-Spady and Probit estimators in Table 7 are used for the first-stage estimator, respectively, and then the pairwise differenced weighted instrumental variables estimator is used in the second stage. For the "Heckman Correction" column, the Probit is used in the first stage, and the Heckman's selection correction estimator with the inverse Mills ratio as an additional regressor is used in the second stage. (ii) $D$ is the number of nonzero market shares observations, $N$ is the effective sample size. (iii) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (iv) Unit of bottle size is liquid ounces. (v) Because Dominick's did not record the price and cost when sales is zero, in estimating "$10^{-8}$" column and "$10^{-4}$" column, we had to use the average prices and costs of the same product with the same promotion statuses of other stores.

### D.3 Laundry Detergent Demand for Week 375

In this subsection, we estimate the demand for laundry detergent using the same Dominick's data as in Section 6. We randomly chose a cross section of week 375, which is the third week of November 1996. The product is defined by UPC, and the market is defined by the week-store pair.

We compute the market shares by loads. There are two types of laundry detergents: liquid and powder. We convert the size of a canister by the following criteria. For liquid laundry detergent, 1.6 ounces are counted as 1 load. For powder laundry detergent, 2.3 ounces are counted as 1 load. Some powder detergents used pounds instead of ounces as the unit of the package size.[15] For such products, 0.08262 pounds is counted as 1 load. Since the density of powder detergents are around $0.65\text{g}/cm^3$ and $1\text{g}/cm^3 = 0.065198\text{lb}/\text{oz}$, 1 pound of powder detergent is approximately 23.6 ounces. The market size is calculated by assuming each consumer visiting the store consumes 6 loads of laundry detergent a week. Other details about the data are similar to what we described in Section 6.

Table 9 presents the first-stage estimates, and Table 10 presents the second-stage estimates. We find the same pattern as in Table 4 in Section 6: even after instrumenting for the prices, the estimated demand curve is upward sloping when the choice set selection is not considered in the estimation.

[15] It happened only for Arms and Hammers powder detergent.

Table 9: First-stage Parameter Estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$

| $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ | Probit | Klein-Spady |
|---|---|---|
| Package Size | 1 | 1 |
| | (0.091) | (−) |
| Liquid | 379.843 | 320.578 |
| | (16.031) | (5.676) |
| Heavy duty / Concentrated / Double | 114.862 | −18.295 |
| | (42.456) | (5.571) |
| Bleach | −6.144 | −0.279 |
| | (18.997) | (2.714) |
| Tide | 230.570 | 266.716 |
| | (20.483) | (5.676) |
| Wisk | 31.895 | −94.849 |
| | (27.169) | (4.451) |
| Ajax / Arm&Hammer / Surf / Purex | −240.998 | −152.440 |
| | (22.464) | (4.440) |
| % Blacks and Hispanics | 18.464 | −4.242 |
| | (57.478) | (8.147) |
| % College Graduates | 242.359 | 1.831 |
| | (91.294) | (13.016) |
| Log Median Income | −9.221 | −2.217 |
| | (48.458) | (6.950) |
| $D$ | 7177 | 7177 |
| $N$ | 14999 | 14999 |

Note. (i) $D$ is the number of nonzero market shares observations and $N$ is the sample size. (ii) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (iii) Unit of package size is converted to liquid ounces. (iv) We normalized the coefficients of Package Size to one.

Table 10: Second-stage Parameter Estimates $\left(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)$

| | | Our Model | | | Logit Model | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t})$ | First Stage: | K/S | Probit | Heckman | Zero: | Drop 0 | $10^{-8}$ | $10^{-4}$ |
| Log Price ($-\sigma$) | | −0.991 | −0.823 | −1.059 | | 6.455 | 9.755 | 6.371 |
| | | (0.069) | (0.194) | (0.044) | | (0.095) | (0.138) | (0.064) |
| Package Size | | 0.009 | 0.004 | 0.000 | | 0.030 | 0.038 | 0.026 |
| | | (0.003) | (0.004) | (0.001) | | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) |
| Liquid | | 3.077 | 1.585 | −0.032 | | 6.551 | 9.990 | 6.020 |
| | | (0.985) | (1.538) | (0.296) | | (0.153) | (0.228) | (0.106) |
| Heavy duty / | | −0.397 | 0.318 | −0.435 | | 4.218 | 7.803 | 4.108 |
| Concentrated / Double | | (0.104) | (0.843) | (0.143) | | (0.249) | (0.467) | (0.217) |
| Bleach | | −0.016 | −0.016 | −0.035 | | 0.575 | 0.837 | 0.720 |
| | | (0.039) | (0.053) | (0.054) | | (0.101) | (0.172) | (0.080) |
| Tide | | 3.510 | 1.503 | 0.826 | | 0.796 | 2.055 | 0.578 |
| | | (0.872) | (0.793) | (0.183) | | (0.099) | (0.175) | (0.081) |
| Wisk | | −0.491 | 0.038 | −0.033 | | −0.613 | −1.118 | −0.742 |
| | | (0.257) | (0.103) | (0.071) | | (0.137) | (0.229) | (0.107) |
| Ajax / ArmHammer / | | −0.722 | −0.490 | 0.323 | | 1.715 | 3.180 | 2.034 |
| Surf / Purex | | (0.437) | (0.806) | (0.199) | | (0.133) | (0.226) | (0.105) |
| $D$ | | 7177 | 7177 | 7177 | | 7177 | 10639 | 10639 |
| $N$ | | 14999 | 14999 | 14999 | | 7177 | 10639 | 10639 |

Note. (i) For columns "Our Model, K/S" and "Our Model, Probit," results from Klein-Spady and Probit estimators in Table 9 are used for the first-stage estimator, respectively, and then the pairwise differenced weighted instrumental variables estimator is used in the second stage. For the "Heckman Correction" column, the Probit is used in the first stage, and the Heckman's selection correction estimator with the inverse Mills ratio as an additional regressor is used in the second stage. (ii) $D$ is the number of nonzero market shares observations, $N$ is the effective sample size. (iii) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (iv) Unit of package size is converted to liquid ounces. (v) Because Dominick's did not provide with the price and cost data when sales is zero, in estimating "$10^{-8}$" column and "$10^{-4}$" column, we had to use the average prices and costs of the same product with the same promotion statuses of other stores.

## D.4 Laundry Detergent Demand for Week 398

In this subsection, we estimate the demand for laundry detergent using the same Dominick's data as in the previous subsection. We selected a cross section of week 398, which is the last week of April 1997. Other details in data handling are the same with the previous subsection.

Table 11: First-stage Parameter Estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$

| $\mathbf{w}_{j,t}$ | Probit | Klein-Spady |
|---|---|---|
| Package Size | 1 | 1 |
| | (0.101) | (−) |
| Liquid | 345.336 | 449.144 |
| | (17.758) | (6.124) |
| Heavy duty / Concentrated / Double | 111.494 | 123.172 |
| | (48.905) | (5.447) |
| Bleach | −1.811 | 6.195 |
| | (20.737) | (2.008) |
| Tide | 341.478 | 387.581 |
| | (23.082) | (7.019) |
| Wisk | 191.418 | 242.408 |
| | (31.135) | (7.153) |
| Ajax / Arm&Hammer / Surf / Purex | −94.144 | −143.853 |
| | (24.119) | (3.401) |
| % Blacks and Hispanics | 101.921 | −3.192 |
| | (63.318) | (6.717) |
| % College Graduates | 141.812 | −3.712 |
| | (101.556) | (11.025) |
| Log Median Income | 21.230 | −0.033 |
| | (52.890) | (5.735) |
| $D$ | 7177 | 7177 |
| $N$ | 14999 | 14999 |

Note. (i) $D$ is the number of nonzero market shares observations and $N$ is the sample size. (ii) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (iii) Unit of package size is converted to liquid ounces. (iv) We normalized the coefficients of Package Size to one.

Table 12: Second-stage Parameter Estimates $\left(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)$

| | | Our Model | | | Logit Model | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $(\phi_{j,t}, \mathbf{x}_{j,t})$ | First Stage: | K/S | Probit | Heckman | Zero: | Drop 0 | $10^{-8}$ | $10^{-4}$ |
| Log Price ($-\sigma$) | | −0.664 | −0.779 | −0.938 | | 3.287 | 9.632 | 6.617 |
| | | (0.080) | (0.135) | (0.051) | | (0.036) | (0.157) | (0.077) |
| Package Size | | 0.012 | 0.007 | 0.000 | | 0.009 | 0.037 | 0.028 |
| | | (0.001) | (0.002) | (0.001) | | (0.000) | (0.001) | (0.001) |
| Liquid | | 6.189 | 2.554 | −0.070 | | 1.861 | 9.688 | 6.287 |
| | | (0.629) | (1.074) | (0.390) | | (0.065) | (0.254) | (0.124) |
| Heavy duty / | | 0.660 | −0.156 | −0.699 | | 0.780 | 0.087 | 4.105 |
| Concentrated / Double | | (0.198) | (0.246) | (0.207) | | (0.160) | (0.488) | (0.238) |
| Bleach | | 0.084 | 0.044 | 0.040 | | −0.066 | 1.388 | 0.803 |
| | | (0.042) | (0.083) | (0.071) | | (0.063) | (0.189) | (0.092) |
| Tide | | 5.678 | 2.620 | −0.028 | | −0.262 | 1.579 | −0.171 |
| | | (0.538) | (1.045) | (0.371) | | (0.062) | (0.190) | (0.092) |
| Wisk | | 3.657 | 1.186 | −0.305 | | −1.196 | 1.025 | 0.097 |
| | | (0.441) | (0.562) | (0.231) | | (0.088) | (0.258) | (0.126) |
| Ajax / ArmHammer / | | −1.003 | −0.105 | 0.191 | | 0.601 | 2.719 | 1.681 |
| Surf / Purex | | (0.178) | (0.332) | (0.144) | | (0.081) | (0.227) | (0.111) |
| $D$ | | 6339 | 6339 | 6339 | | 6339 | 8587 | 8587 |
| $N$ | | 13625 | 13625 | 13625 | | 13625 | 8587 | 8587 |

Note. (i) For columns "Our Model, K/S" and "Our Model, Probit," results from Klein-Spady and Probit estimators in Table 11 are used for the first-stage estimator, respectively, and then the pairwise differenced weighted instrumental variables estimator is used in the second stage. For the "Heckman Correction" column, the Probit is used in the first stage, and the Heckman's selection correction estimator with the inverse Mills ratio as an additional regressor is used in the second stage. (ii) $D$ is the number of nonzero market shares observations, $N$ is the effective sample size. (iii) Asymptotic standard error estimates are in the parentheses. (iv) Unit of package size is converted to liquid ounces. (v) Because Dominick's did not provide with the price and cost data when sales is zero, in estimating "$10^{-8}$" column and "$10^{-4}$" column, we had to use the average prices and costs of the same product with the same promotion statuses of other stores.